DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 415 233 SP 037 750

AUTHOR Fountain, Cheryl Ann
TITLE Collaborative Agenda for Change: Examining the Impact of Urban Professional Development Schools.
PUB DATE 1997-02-27
NOTE 81p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Phoenix, AZ, February 27, 1997).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; Partnerships in Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Professional Development Schools; Student Teacher Attitudes; Student Teaching; *Urban Schools; *Urban Teaching
IDENTIFIERS Florida

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the evolution of a Professional Development School (PDS) continuum for urban teachers through 5 years of school-university collaboration. The paper reports the impact on education students completing internship experiences at urban PDS's, discusses the impact of the collaborative initiative on PDS faculty, and identifies implications at the district and university levels. For several years, the Duval County Schools and the University of North Florida College of Education have collaboratively engaged in reform initiatives targeting urban schooling and preparation of urban teachers. Two of the most recent initiatives are the AT&T Teachers for Tomorrow Project and the Jacksonville Urban Educational Partnership (JUEP). Creating urban PDS's served as the central focus of the projects. Surveys of AT&T and JUEP interns, non-interns, and experienced teachers examined planning, instruction, time management, student diversity, reflective thought, collegiality, beliefs about urban schools, efficacy, and accepting positions in different kinds of school settings. Results indicated that the PDS experience positively affected both groups of PDS interns' confidence levels for teaching in urban schools. The increased confidence led to large numbers of PDS interns actively seeking positions in urban schools. Most PDS interns considered the experience worthwhile. Five appendixes offer data from surveys of interns, teachers, and schools. (Contains approximately 70 references.) (SM)

COLLABORATIVE AGENDA FOR CHANGE
Examining the Impact of Urban Professional Development Schools

Prepared for the Annual Meeting
American Association of Colleges
for Teacher Education(AACTE)
Phoenix, Arizona
February 27, 1997

Collaborative Agenda for Change
Examining the Impact of Urban Professional Development Schools

Prepared for the Annual Meeting
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
Phoenix, Arizona
February 27, 1997

by
Cheryl Ann Fountain
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of North Florida

Robert Drummond
Professor of Education
College of Education and Human Services
University of North Florida

Florence Marquardt
Visiting Assistant Professor
College of Education and Human Services
University of North Florida

Frances Powell
Professor of Education
College of Education and Human Services
University of North Florida

Kathleen Witsell
Resident Clinical Faculty
Duval County Public School
University of North Florida

Collaborative Agenda for Change
Examining the Impact of Urban Professional Development Schools

I. Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to (1) describe the evolution of a professional development continuum for urban teachers through five years of school/university collaboration; (2) report the impact on education students completing internship experiences at urban professional development schools; (3) provide a status report on the impact of the collaborative initiative on the PDS faculty; and (4) identify implications at the district and university levels.

II. Background and Context

Presses for Change

The Duval County Schools and the University of North Florida College of Education enjoy a long history of collaboration. Two of the most recent collaborative initiatives are the AT&T Teachers for Tomorrow project (funded by the AT&T Foundation), and the Jacksonville Urban Educational Partnership (funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement of Education). Both reform initiatives have been influenced by and attempt to take into account three "pressure sources" that are pushing to change and reshape both K-12 education and teacher preparation.

First, national and state reform agendas are demanding new ways of thinking about schooling, achieving challenging education outcomes, and creating stronger links between education and emerging workplace competencies. Redesigned schools, classrooms, preparation and professional development programs are being pressured to become more aligned with and to reorder instructional and curricular practices with these emerging social and economic priorities. Dramatic changes in practice are needed if we are to successfully manage the swirl of technological, political, cultural, and information changes sweeping across local, state, national and international landscapes. Cross-cultural understanding and communication; developing competence in creating, sustaining, and working in teams; becoming skilled in solving poorly defined and complex problems; managing information overload and the rapidity of change; and navigating and working in cyberspace are quickly becoming essential learning tools for school- and university-based educators.

Second, the recognition that achievement levels of all students, particularly those underserved in the past, is a necessary condition for continued economic and social prosperity. The problems facing urban schools have reached crisis proportions. Poor and minority children

come from the lowest income levels, have the least access to health care, are taught by the least prepared and least experienced teachers, and have less expected of them. Fundamental and simultaneous changes are needed in urban schools and the governmental agencies and communities in which they are located. Changes in schools' rules, roles, relationships in with the community, policies, and instructional and curricular practices must be invented and implemented. Changes must also be implemented by governmental agencies and communities to reduce the environmental risk-factors impacting academic achievement -- a condition equally as important as school restructuring and systemic change in practice.

Third, the recognition that to change student performance, changes in teacher competence and performance are required. If schools are to become "learning organizations" where both children and adults continuously improve, then dramatic changes must occur (a) in the ways teachers are prepared and the competencies they demonstrate upon entering the profession; (b) in the culture and structure of the profession; and (c) in teachers' roles and responsibilities. Ongoing inquiry, continuous learning, and collaboration with other professionals must become integral parts of daily life in schools and universities.

These kinds of substantive change require systemic and simultaneous change across the various levels of the educational enterprise coupled with authentic collaboration across institutional boundaries. The concept of professional development schools, grounded in school/university collaboration, offers a promising strategy for inter-institutional change and educational reform. But professional development schools require creating different organizational structures, developing new roles, and securing additional resources either through external sources or by reallocating internal resources. The "hidden" but equally difficult challenge in establishing professional development schools, however, is the fact that to be successful, individual and institutional beliefs, practices, and cultures must change. This necessary condition is no small matter, as it requires a profound shift in mind sets; developing shared visions; acquiring and using different knowledge bases and skills; ongoing inquiry; a great deal of concerted effort; coping with discomfort; and negotiating conflict as cultures, values, and past practices clash.

Urban School District and University Demographics

Jacksonville and the surrounding Duval County were consolidated in the late 1960's so that the entire 840 square mile county now makes up the City of Jacksonville. The Duval County Public School System serves the City of Jacksonville, including the inner city, the suburbs, and the beaches. Duval County is the fifteenth largest urban school district in the nation, enrolling over 125,000 students in grades Pre K-12. The school population is approximately 56% white, 39% African-American, 2.6% Asian or Pacific Islander, 2.4% Hispanic, and .1% Native American. Students of different racial and ethnic backgrounds are not distributed proportionately across all schools. Student achievement is also not equally distributed. There are significant gaps in

achievement among schools with a high proportion of white students as compared to those with high proportions of minority students.

The school district has implemented several projects to address these issues. These include a district-wide magnet school program; a district-wide plan to improve achievement of all students; an emphasis on redesigning professional development; an aggressive partnership outreach initiative to increase the number of community and business partners for each of the 150 Duval County schools; along with several collaborative initiatives with the University of North Florida.

The University of North Florida was established in 1972 as an upper division institution with approximately 2000 students. In 1984 a lower division was added with the first doctoral program in Educational Leadership beginning in 1990. Today, UNF has just over 11,000 students enrolled in 44 undergraduate and 22 graduate programs. Approximately 58% of UNF students come from Duval County, with 33% coming from other Florida counties, and 9% coming from other states or other countries. The student body is approximately 80% white, predominately female (60%), and has an average age of 28. The College of Education includes 48 full-time faculty and approximately 2000 students. Improving urban education and the preparation of urban educators is a College and university priority. Education faculty have been actively engaged in collaborative reform initiatives with urban schools for the past ten years. Finally, a large number of COE graduates become teachers in Duval County and elect to teach in inner city schools.

III. Collaborative Agenda for Change

Professional Development Continuum for Urban Educators

Beginning in 1987, the Duval County Schools and the UNF College of Education embarked on a partnership to improve the preparation of urban teachers and improve urban schooling in Jacksonville. The success of this initial work led to an invitation from the AT&T Foundation in 1991 to become one of five national sites to design and implement a change model linking teacher preparation and public school renewal in urban settings as part of the AT&T Teachers for Tomorrow Program. The school/university partnership was expanded to include the Duval Teachers United and the Florida Community College at Jacksonville.

In 1994, the Jacksonville Urban Educational Partnership (JUEP) was funded by the U.S. Department of Education. This initiative built upon the "lessons learned" in the AT&T project. The change model that was developed for the AT&T initiative and refined in the JUEP project. It centers around a "continuum of professional development for urban teachers" (see Figure 1).

Figure 1
----Professional Development Continuum for Urban Educators----

Using the Professional Development Continuum for Urban Educators as the organizing construct, a Collaborative Change Network was formed. This Collaborative Change Network intentionally linked preservice, inservice, and student achievement at each point along the continuum by (a) redefining university and school-based roles; (b) implementing initiatives that required active involvement of partners from each partner institution and the community; and (c) having project activities organized and carried out by inter-institutional strategic learning teams.

This professional development change model is grounded in five theoretical bases (a) educational reform and collaboration literature (Holmes Group, 1986, 1990, 1995; Popkewitz, 1988; Goodlad, 1984, 1990; Cochran, Smith & Lyte, 1990; Schlechty, 1990; Louis & Simsek, 1991; Murphy, 1991; SCANS Report, 1991; Dilworth, 1992; Wehlage, Smith & Limpman, 1992; Sarason, 1993, 1995; Darling-Hammond, 1994; Fine, 1994; Fountain & Evans, 1994; Wilson & Daviss, 1994; Hess, 1995; O'Hair & Odell, 1995); (b) the systemic change and change process literature (Hall & Hord, 1987; Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin, & Hall, 1987; Loucks-Horsely, 1985, 1989; Leithwood, 1990; Senge, 1990; Fullan, 1991, 1993; Kennedy, 1991; Sallis, 1993); (c) constructivist orientation to learning and its impact on standards of practice (Schon, 1987; Zeichner, 1988; Kennedy, 1989; Reilly, 1989; Resnick & Klopfer, 1989; National Science Teachers Association, 1990; Zeichner & Liston, 1990; National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 1991; Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1992); (d) the effective schools literature, cultural diversity, and the work related to teachers' work and school culture (Little, 1982, 1993; Feiman-Nemser, & Floden, 1986; Grant, 1986; Bennett, 1987; Banks, 1988, 1989; Joyce, 1988, 1989; Christner, 1990; Levine & Lezotte, 1990; Hodgkinson, 1991; Kozol, 1991; Levine, 1991; Lezotte & Jacoby, 1991; Tabachich & Zeichner, 1991; Boysen, 1992; Little & McLaughlin, 1993; O'Hara-Devereaux & Johanse, 1994; Rendon & Hope, 1996); and (e) the development of teacher expertise and professional standards (Kennedy, 1987; Shulman, 1986, 1987; Berliner, 1988, 1994; Anderson, 1989; Barnes, 1989; Mayer & Brause, 1991; Florida Blueprint 2000, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995; INTASC, 1992; Zimpher, 1992; Pultorak, 1993; National Board for Professional Standards, 1994; Florida Standards Commission, 1994; Zeichner, Melnick & Gomez, 1996).

Creating Urban Professional Development Schools

From the literature and past collaborative experiences, five "guiding principles" emerged and are used to guide collaborative initiatives. They include the belief that (a) teaching practices stem from teachers' beliefs therefore change in practice depends on change in beliefs; (b) reflecting, translating research findings into usable practices, and sharing problems and insights with school-based and university colleagues stimulates the change process; (c) change begins by

building on existing strengths and values; (d) long lasting change starts with purposeful actions but must focus on creating conditions that foster commitment, development of new skills and shared visions; (e) change is ongoing, filled with uncertainty, often disruptive, and includes conflict; and (e) creating and sustaining change requires additional and "just-in -time" resources.

The Holmes Group (1990) defined professional development schools (PDSs) as "schools for the development of novice professionals, for the continuing development of experienced professionals, and for the research and development of the teaching profession." Six principles were laid out as organizational frames: (a) teaching and learning for understanding; (b) creating a learning community; (c) teaching and learning for understanding for everybody's children by overcoming the educational and social barriers raised by an unequal society; (d) continuing learning by teachers, university faculty, and administrators; (e) thoughtful long-term inquiry into teaching and learning; and (f) inventing a new institution.

A limitation in this conception of professional development schools emerged when trying to use this definition and put these principles into practice. There was an uneven balance in attention being paid to the development of teachers and the profession versus the achievement of students.

To overcome this obstacle, four other guiding principles were included as we created urban professional development schools in Jacksonville. These included (g) improving student achievement by developing high expectations for teachers; changing student perceptions of their abilities and potential for achievement; and by organizing learning around clear standards; (h) conceptualizing urban professional development schools as "emerging sites of effective practice" rather than "exemplary sites" where university students and faculty work collaboratively with urban teachers and administrators to improve practice, develop new knowledge, engage in the change process, and contribute to the transformation of an urban school into an urban learning community; (i) establishing purposeful partnerships with the broader community (families, community organizations, businesses); and (j) approaching collaboration as a way of addressing individual partner needs by collectively identifying problems and creating solutions which address the needs of both partners and accomplish shared goals.

Our conception of urban professional development schools was expanded to include both internship professional development schools and preinternship development schools. By including more urban schools in the Collaborative Change Network, we were able to extend the professional network, increase access to new ideas, to emerging knowledge bases, and to other collaborative arrangements. As part of this expansion, the professional development element of the continuum became more focused and centered on linking professional development, student achievement, and challenging standards.

Redesigned School-Based and University Faculty Roles

Six positions jointly funded by the university and the school district were created: two preinternship clinical educators (EXCEL Clinical Educators) and four internship clinical educators (Resident Clinical Faculty). Other redesigned roles include school-based university faculty (Lead Faculty) and inter-institutional collaborative work teams (Strategic Learning Teams).

EXCEL Clinical Educators are exemplary classroom teachers with two-year joint assignments with the university and school district. A portion of their time is spent on the university campus or in preinternship PDSs conducting preinternship field-based seminars for students in the teacher preparation program. The other portion of their time is spent in district-based teams addressing district concerns.

Resident Clinical Faculty (RCFs) are exemplary classroom teachers with two-year joint university and school district assignments. Two RCFs are assigned to each internship professional development school. They devote half of their time to supervising up to eighteen student teachers assigned to the PDS. The RCFs cooperatively plan and supervise the internship experience with classroom and university personnel. They plan and conduct inquiry seminars for student teachers. They spend half of their time assisting school-based colleagues implement school improvement plans that focus on changing the teaching and learning taking place in classrooms. They work collaboratively with Lead Faculty in implementing site-based inquiry seminars. The RCFs assume the three related roles. These include emerging expert in content, emerging expert in process, and emerging expert in organizational design. The emerging expert role requires RCFs to learn to do something as well as learning about something.

The RCFs come to campus every other week and, with university faculty, participate in two inquiry seminars. The first seminar focuses attention on the school improvement initiatives in which the RCFs are involved. The second seminar focuses attention on clinical supervision and the mentoring of novice teachers. The expertise gained from these seminars strengthens the professional growth and development of these classroom teachers. This acquired expertise is shared with colleagues at the school sites, among the RCFs themselves, and with student teachers.

Lead Faculty are university faculty who spend from one to two days each week at the internship PDSs implementing a collaboratively planned standards-based inquiry seminar. The seminar uses classroom-based inquiry to improve urban teaching and learning and to solve pressing problems facing the PDS faculty. Lead Faculty serve as liaisons between the university and the professional development school and work collaboratively with the Resident Clinical Faculty. They become emerging experts in areas in which they may be unfamiliar but which are important to the PDS teachers with whom they are working. Lead Faculty also chair or co-chair

the school-based Strategic Learning Team. They often function as a conduit by posing questions that use a different perceptual lens and by bringing research-based information to bear on issues being tackled by the Strategic Learning Team.

Strategic Learning Teams (SLTs) are inter-institutional collaborative work teams organized to plan, implement, and assess collaborative initiatives. SLTs function using four agreed-upon principles:

- Unity of Purpose - SLTs are charged with developing and articulating a shared vision for their component on the Professional Development Continuum;

- Decision-Making - Members of each SLT assume responsibility for making important decisions about how to fulfill the agreed upon vision. These decisions are grounded in inquiry, and the use of research and best practice. SLTs assume responsibility for evaluating and determining if the most appropriate decision was made, looking to see where problems arise, and taking corrective actions. Each SLT has authority and responsibility for its operating budget;

- Ongoing Inquiry - SLTs engage in a cycle of continuous planning using multiple knowledge sources, think tank/reflection, improvised implementation, think tank/reflection, refined practice, think tank/reflection, and assessment;

- Commitment to Change and Risk-Taking - The inter-institutional nature of the SLTs and the kinds of responsibilities they assume provide psychological support and technical assistance to SLT members learn and apply new skills and knowledge. The SLTs become change facilitators for the members as well as for their respective organizations. Because change takes place over time and involves anxiety and uncertainty, the SLT serves as a support network as members risk changing their own behavior and become agents of change. The SLTs also serve as "negotiating forums" as points of tension arise from the clash of public school and university cultures and their differing views of schooling, teaching, problem-solving, knowing, and uses of knowledge.

AT&T and JUEP Internship Professional Development Schools

Six urban Duval County elementary schools serve(d) as the two AT&T and four JUEP Internship Professional Development Schools. S.P. Livingston (640 students) and Andrew A. Robinson (1100 students) elementary schools were part of the AT&T initiative. Susie Tolbert/ R.V. Daniels (1100 students), and R.L. Brown/Moncrief (1100 students) elementary schools are

part of the current JUEP initiative. The majority of the children (80 - 95%) attending these schools come from low-income, African-American families. These PDS students consistently score well below schools with 30% or less of the children coming from low income families; have higher retention rates; and lower attendance rates (see Table 1).

Table 1
A Comparison of Student Characteristics

Student Characteristics	Elem Schools with 30% or less Students from Low-Income Families	Elem Schools with 70% or more Students from Low-Income Families
Avg Retention Rate	2.1%	4.5%
Avg Attendance Rate	96.1%	93.9%
Median Composite CTBS (Rdg)	64.3 (percentile score)	36.9 (percentile score)

Salient Features of the AT&T and JUEP Internship Professional Development Schools

• Each PDS is an urban school with a large proportion of students coming from low income families. They are characterized by high levels of underachievement, retention and student mobility; and by teachers and administrators who commit to engage in a collaborative process to restructure the teaching and learning taking place in their schools and the preparation of urban teachers.

• Each PDS serves as a clinical internship site for up to eighteen UNF College of Education students each term. The interns are provided with opportunities to not only develop and refine their own practice, but also to participate and contribute to the transformation of an urban school into a learning community. The large number of interns assigned to the PDS creates an opportunity to alter traditional patterns of interaction and practice of experienced teachers, university interns, and university faculty.

• Redesigned school-based and university-based roles are implemented at each PDS. These include Resident Clinical Faculty (exemplary teachers with alternative assignments to work with student teachers and colleagues implementing school improvement plans); Lead Faculty (university faculty who spend one-two days each week at the PDS site implementing an collaboratively planned inquiry seminar; work on-to-one basis with PDS teachers in their classrooms; and assist in implementing family and community involvement activities); Strategic Learning Teams (collaborative work teams charged with planning, implementing, and evaluating collaborative initiatives); and Inquiry Seminars (collaboratively planned and conducted seminars where school and university-based faculty seek relevant and practical solutions to real problems using the inquiry process).

• Organizing collaborative initiatives around seven professional norms of collegiality, teacher-as-decision maker, experimentation and risk-taking, ongoing inquiry, reflectivity,

commitment to teaching, and multicultural sensitivity. The development of the professional norms was influenced by the work of Little (1982), Little and McLaughlin (1993), the Holmes Group (1990), and past collaborative initiatives. The AT&T and JUEP professional norms are defined as:

- *Collegiality* - collaborates by sharing ideas, information, and insights and by by teaching and working with other professionals to improve practice;

- *Experimentation and Risk-Taking* - routinely varies from traditional modes of teaching in an effort to improve student achievement by using research, evolving knowledge bases, and best practice to guide the selection of innovations; recognizes the possibilities of failure; and reflects, evaluates, and modifies as needed;

- *Reflectivity* - uses past and current educational and professional experiences as perceptual screens to make rational and informed choices, to evaluate the effectiveness of those choices, and to improve instructional performance;

- *Multicultural Sensitivity* - creates and sustains a learning environment for urban students which adapts learning experiences to meet special needs and learning styles, draws upon community and family resources to enhance academic and social success, and includes multilingual, multiethnic, and culturally diverse learning experiences; demonstrates respect for and appreciation of and understanding of students' cultural, ethnic/racial, social, economic, and gender backgrounds;

- *Teacher-as-Decision-Maker* - capable of making reasonable judgments, articulating the rationale for those decisions, and modifying their actions based on additional data and information; unwilling to abdicate their responsibility for student achievement and success; and possess or acquire the skills and knowledge bases needed to bring about high levels of student learning;

- *Ongoing Inquiry* - experiments and improves practice throughout professional career by using a reflective and inquiry-based process to seek answers to instructional questions; to analyze school practices and their own behavior; to assess how those practices and behaviors contribute to patterns of high and low achievement; to seek ways to replace unproductive practices; and to seek solutions to poorly defined and complex instructional and curricular related dilemmas;

- *Commitment to Teaching* - understands the nature of teaching as a service profession; committed to helping all students succeed; committed to ongoing acquisition of new knowledge and practices and willingness to change.

IV. Impact and Outcomes

To assess the differences in perceptions between UNF College of Education students completing their internship experiences at urban AT&T and JUEP PDS sites and those completing

student teaching at Non-PDS sites, survey instruments were developed and administered during the spring terms of each collaborative initiative.

To assess changes in JUEP teachers' attitudes and impact on school climate, a time series design is being used. Baseline data were collected during the first year of the JUEP initiative. One hundred and twelve teachers from the JUEP PDS sites completed the JUEP School Climate Survey during Year One. Sixty teachers (approximately 85% of the combined staffs) completed the JUEP School Climate Survey at the end of Year Two. A status report comparing Year One and Year Two results is included as part of this paper.

Differences in Perceptions between AT&T and JUEP PDS Interns and Non-PDS Interns

The AT&T survey instrument included 92 items organized into eight dimensions (a) planning, (b) instruction, (c) time management, (d) student diversity, (e) reflective thought, (f) efficacy, and (g) accepting a position in different kinds of school settings.

The JUEP survey instrument included 88 items organized into nine dimensions (a) planning, (b) instruction, (c) instructional management, (d) classroom management, (e) diversity, (f) reflective thought, (g) collegiality, (h) beliefs about urban schools, and (i) accepting a position in different kinds of school settings. There are 38 items that were common to both the AT&T and JUEP survey instruments.

Differences In Perceptions Between AT&T PDS Interns and Non-PDS Interns

At the conclusion of the 1994 Spring term, a survey instrument was administered to both the AT&T PDS interns and the Non-PDS interns to compare their perceptions of their confidence levels in eight dimensions. Significant differences were found on 47 of the 92 items. As noted in Table 2 and in Appendix A, the AT&T PDS interns reported higher confidence levels in all eight dimensions than did the Non-PDS interns. Significant differences at the .05 level were found in five items related to the planning dimension; fourteen items related to the instruction dimension; six items related to the time management dimension; seven items related to the student diversity dimension; seven items related to the reflective thought dimension; one item related to efficacy; and four items related to accepting a position in different kinds of school settings.

Table 2

A Comparison of AT&T PDS and Non-PDS Intern Perceptions

Confidence Levels of Teaching Dimensions	Number of Items	Number of Significant Differences
Planning Dimension	9	5
Instruction Dimension	24	14
Time Management Dimension	12	6
Classroom Management Dimension	13	3
Student Diversity Dimension	8	7
Reflective Thought Dimension	13	7
Efficacy Dimension	5	1
Accepting a Position in Different School Settings	8	4

This evidence supports the hypothesis that the AT&T PDS experience positively impacted the confidence levels of the COE interns completing their internships at the AT&T PDS sites.

Differences In Perceptions Between JUEP PDS Interns and Non-PDS Interns

At the conclusion of the 1996 Spring term, a survey instrument was administered to both the JUEP PDS interns and the Non-PDS interns to compare their perceptions of their confidence levels in nine dimensions. The means for each item were computed along with an analysis of variance and F ratios. Significant differences were found for 31 of the 88 items. As noted in Table 3 and in Appendix B, the JUEP PDS interns reported higher confidence levels in eight of the nine dimensions than did the Non-PDS interns. Significant differences at the .05 level were found in ten items related to the Instruction dimension; three items related to the Instructional Management dimension; three items related to the diversity dimension; five items related to the reflective thought dimension; three items related to collegiality; five items related to beliefs about urban schools; and one items related to accepting a position in different kinds of school settings. No significant differences were found in the planning dimension.

Table 3

A Comparison of JUEP PDS and Non-PDS Intern Perceptions

Confidence Levels of Teaching Dimensions	Number of Items	Number of Significant Differences
Planning Dimension	8	0
Instruction Dimension	29	10
Instructional Management Dimension	6	3
Classroom Management Dimension	9	3
Diversity Dimension	11	4
Reflective Thought Dimension	10	5
Collegiality Dimension	6	3
Beliefs About Urban Schools	7	5
Accepting a Position in Different School Settings	8	1

Again, this evidence supports the hypothesis that the JUEP PDS experience positively impacted the confidence levels of the COE interns completing their internships at the JUEP PDS sites.

Follow-Up Study of AT&T and JUEP PDS Interns Entering the Profession as Beginning Teachers

In the 1995 Fall term, a four-phased follow-up study was designed to (a) identify how many AT&T and JUEP PDS interns were actually teaching in inner city and urban settings; (b) document their experiences as beginning teachers; (c) assess their perceptions about how well prepared they were for teaching; and their attitudes about urban students, communities, and teaching in urban settings; and (d) assess the extent to which they continued to use the PDS professional norms in the first years of practice. The first three phases were completed during the 1996 Spring and 1996 Fall terms.

Phase One consisted of tracking former AT&T and JUEP interns as they began their careers to determine the kinds of schools in which they accepted teaching positions. A listing of the 243 former AT&T PDS interns and 107 JUEP PDS interns was compared to rosters of beginning teachers and teachers currently teaching in Duval and Clay counties.

Phase Two consisted of administering a survey instrument to AT&T PDS intern graduates and Non-PDS beginning teachers at the same urban schools. The Urban Beginning Teacher (UBT) Survey (see Appendix C) was developed to assist in answering the follow-up questions.

The UBT Survey was mailed to 190 AT&T PDS intern graduates and 167 Non-PDS beginning teachers assigned to the same urban schools. 54 UBT Surveys were returned by the AT&T PDS intern graduates. 53 UBT Surveys were returned by Non-PDS beginning teachers. The UBT Survey had a 30% return rate. The reliability of the UBT was computed using two methods. Cronbach's alpha was .9365 (n=65). The split-half coefficient was .847 (n=65).

Phase Three consisted of four ninety-minute focused interview sessions conducted with AT&T PDS intern graduates now teaching in inner city schools. The sessions were recorded and then transcribed. Content and thematic analyses were completed.

Phase Four will be implemented during the 1997 Spring term. The UBT Survey instrument will be sent to JUEP PDS intern graduates to determine those who are now teaching, those who are unemployed, and those who are working in other fields.

Phase One: Current Teaching Assignments

Duval County Public Schools and the University of North Florida College of Education have had urban professional development elementary schools in operation for the past six years as part of the AT&T Teachers for Tomorrow initiative and the Jacksonville Urban Educational Partnership project. Over the span of the AT&T initiative, 243 UNF education students completed internships at an AT&T professional development school. To date, 107 UNF education students have completed internships at a JUEP professional development school. An additional 39 UNF education students are currently enrolled in internship at a JUEP professional development school during the Spring 1997 term. Table 4 summarizes the status of the 350 UNF graduates completing their internship experiences at an urban AT&T or JUEP PDS.

Table 4
Status of Former AT&T and JUEP Interns

Teaching Status of Former PDS Interns	Total Number
AT&T Initiative (1991-1995)	*242 Total*
Currently teaching in Duval County inner city schools (70% or more low income families)	101
Currently teaching in urban Duval County schools	24
Currently teaching in urban Clay County schools	32
Currently teaching in other locations	22
Currently working as substitute teachers	11
Status Unknown	53
JUEP Initiative (1995-to date)	*107 To Date*
Currently teaching in Duval County inner city schools (70% or more low income families)	47
Currently teaching in urban Duval County schools	18
Currently teaching at non-urban or private schools	8
Currently working as substitute teachers	19
Currently working in other fields	4
Currently unemployed and are still in school or are waiting until Fall 1997 to seek employment	6
Status Unknown	5

To date, 72% (252 of 350) AT&T and JUEP PDS intern graduates continue to hold teaching positions. Of those AT&T and JUEP PDS intern graduates now holding full-time teaching positions, a large percentage, 59% (148 of 252) are teaching in inner city schools. 29% (74 of 252) are teaching in urban schools, and 12% (30 of 252) are teaching in other locations.

As for the remaining 28% (98 of 350) of the AT&T and JUEP PDS intern graduates, 37% (36 of 98) are working as substitute teachers; 4% (4 of 98) are working in other fields; 6% (6 of 98) are currently unemployed or still in school; and 53% (52 of 98) have an unknown status.

With 42% of all AT&T and JUEP PDS intern graduates teaching in inner city schools (those with 70% or more of the students coming from low income families) and another 21% teaching in urban

with 70% or more of the students coming from low income families) and another 21% teaching in urban schools, participation in the AT&T and JUEP initiatives has resulted in a large number of PDS intern graduates *choosing to teach* in urban settings and *choosing to continue* working with urban students one, two, three, four, or five years after graduation.

Phase Two: Urban Beginning Teacher Survey

During the Spring 1996 term, a survey instrument was mailed to 190 AT&T and JUEP PDS intern graduates (primarily AT&T) and 167 Non-PDS beginning teachers at the same urban schools. The Urban Beginning Teacher (UBT) Survey included 67 items organized into three dimensions (a) the extent to which respondents carry out tasks associated with the AT&T/JUEP professional norms; (b) the extent to which respondents use particular instructional strategies; (c) beliefs about urban students, their home and community environments, and teaching in urban schools. 54 UBT Surveys were returned by the AT&T PDS intern graduates. 53 UBT Surveys were returned by Non-PDS beginning teachers. The means and standard deviations for each items were calculated.

Using a Likert scale of 1 -5 with 1 being "never," 2 being "seldom," 3 being "frequently," 4 being "usually," and 5 being "routinely," the AT&T PDS intern graduates had higher mean ratings than did the Non-PDS beginning teachers for 38 of the 67 items. The ten highest degrees of implementation for the AT&T PDS intern graduates were on items:

UBT Survey Item	Mean Rating
39. I demonstrate to students that I care about them	4.61
43. I set high standards for myself	4.61
16. I instruct students with a wide range of academic levels and abilities	4.54
44. I help students meet high standards	4.54
38. I demonstrate to each student that I appreciate him/her as an individual	4.50
15. I plan for and instruct students with special needs within my regular classroom	4.41
19. I take responsibility for what students learn and how well they learn	4.39
32. I integrate higher order thinking skills into the daily curriculum	4.37
40. I use a variety of strategies for presenting content	4.37
11. I modify my teaching practices based on my students' performance	4.33

For the Non-PDS beginning teachers, the ten highest degrees of implementation were on items:

UBT Survey Item	Mean Rating
39. I demonstrate to students that I care for them	4.67
43. I set high standards for myself	4.66
16. I instruct students with a wide range of academic levels and abilities	4.63
38. I demonstrate to each student that I appreciate him/her as an individual	4.61
19. I take responsibility for what students learn and how well they learn	4.50
26. I continue to experiment and improve by practice each year	4.44
18. I plan for my own teaching improvement and act on those plans	4.43
40. I use a variety of strategies for presenting content	4.42
17. I help students understand how their beliefs about themselves influence their learning	4.42
44. I help students meet high standards	4.42

Within the 23 items that sampled beliefs about urban students, their homes, community environments, and teaching in urban schools, the AT&T PDS intern graduates had the highest degrees of implementation for 16 of the items. These included:

UBT Survey Item	Mean Rating
46. I understand the needs of urban children	
PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	4.02
Non-PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	3.86
47. I feel confident in implementing cooperative learning activities with urban children and frequently do so	
PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	3.94
Non-PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	3.86
49. My understanding of resiliency and environmental factors influences the way I teach in an urban classroom	
PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	4.08
Non-PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	3.70
51. Urban teachers should be cautions in adopting teaching strategies which give urban students greater inputs into what happens in the classroom	
PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	2.00 *
Non-PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	2.19
53. Resiliency is often used to describe successful urban children	
PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	3.62
Non-PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	3.31
54. If an urban student becomes noisy or disruptive, I feel assured that I know some techniques to get him/her back "on task"	
PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	4.13
Non-PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	3.98

UBT Survey Item (continued)	Mean Rating
56. When working with urban students, teachers should focus a majority of their instruction on "basic" objectives and skill development	
PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	2.86 *
Non-PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	2.91
57. When students work in groups, the teacher can't really evaluate their work	
PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	1.53 *
Non-PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	1.77
58. Teachers in urban schools should rely primarily on teacher=directed, focused, whole group instruction	
PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	1.88 *
Non-PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	2.09
60. The most important job of teachers is to encourage students to think about questioning the world around them	
PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	3.79
Non-PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	3.72
61. The most important job of teachers is to teach content	
PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	2.62 *
Non-PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	2.78
63. I am sure teaching will be my life-long career	
PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	3.66
Non-PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	3.61
64. I look forward to coming to school each day	
PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	3.86
Non-PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	3.80
65. There are some urban students who are unreachable	
PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	2.11
Non-PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	2.76
66. Past achievement is the best indicator of how well students will perform in school	
PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	1.89 *
Non-PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	1.91
67. For effective learning to take place, I need to be in control of all activities	
PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	2.58 *
Non-PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	2.95

* item is negatively worded, so a lower mean rating is desirable

Next for each item, the AT&T PDS intern graduates and Non-PDS beginning teacher means were computed. A t-test for independent samples was used to determine if the differences in the means between the AT&T PDS intern graduates differed significantly from those of the Non-PDS beginning teachers.

Significant differences at the .05 level were found for eight items (see Appendix D). In six of the eight items, the AT&T PDS intern graduates means were significantly higher that those of

the Non-PDS beginning teachers. For two of the eight items, the Non-PDS beginning teacher means were significantly higher at the .05 level than those of the AT&T PDS intern graduates. The items that had significant differences included:

UBT Survey Item	*Mean*	*T Value*	*DF*	*2-Tail Probability*
• *I take the lead in working/planning cooperatively with fellow teachers*				
PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	4.02	2.44	105	.016
Non-PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	3.51			
• *I collaboratively develop/implement learning experiences with fellow teachers on a regular basis*				
PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	3.89	2.15	105	.034
Non-PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	3.44			
• *I work toward building a learning community within my school*				
PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	4.22	2.40	108	.018
Non-PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	3.80			
• *I effectively teach diverse ethnic groups of students*				
PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	3.68	-2.37	108	.020 *
Non-PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	4.21			
• *I strengthen my professional growth by enrolling in university courses*				
PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	2.72	-2.38	97	.019 *
Non-PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	3.43			
• *I know how to select and use at least three pieces of instructional software*				
PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	4.15	2.32	108	.022
Non-PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	3.59			
• *My understanding of resiliency and environmental factors influences the way I teach in a urban classroom*				
PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	4.08	2.00	106	.049
Non-PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	3.70			
• *There are some urban students who are unreachable*				
PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	2.11	-2.74	106	.007 **
Non-PDS Beg Teachers in Urban Schools	2.76			

* For each of these items, the Non-PDS beginning teachers had significantly higher means than did the AT&T PDS beginning teachers.

** This item is negatively worded, so a lower mean rating is desirable.

Phase Three: Focused Interviews with Beginning Teachers Teaching in Inner City Schools

Forty-one AT&T PDS intern graduates who are now teaching in inner city schools participated in one of four focus sessions. They were asked to assess their preparation program and their perceptions of their current levels of knowledge and competency. These sessions were recorded and transcribed. Content and thematic analyses were completed. These data were combined with the sentence stem responses from their teachers' responses on the Urban Beginning Teacher Survey.

• *In what ways did the AT&T PDS experience prepare you for teaching in urban classroom?*

Four themes emerged from the discussion around this question. First, the AT&T PDS intern graduates strongly endorsed the PDS model and agreed that it had prepared them for urban teaching. Second, AT&T PDS intern graduates noted that the "culture shock" often experienced by beginning teachers in urban schools was embedded into their internship experience. Any nervousness of teaching in inner city schools was dispelled before their careers began. Third, AT&T PDS intern graduates commented that the "hype and negative publicity" surrounding inner city schools is not altogether accurate -- it isn't as negative as what they had been led to believe before becoming an AT&T PDS intern. Fourth, many recognized that being placed in an urban school helped them grow as individuals, helped them realize the challenges associated with teaching in inner city schools, helped them to learn to maintain a positive attitude in difficult situations, recognize the importance of working as a team, and learning how to adapt quickly to the different learning needs of their students.

• *What factors helped you decide to accept a position in an inner city school?*

Many commented that they had been recruited by urban principals at the conclusion of their AT&T PDS internship experience. They felt prepared for the urban classroom as a result of their PDS experience and actively sought a teaching position in an urban school. Several commented that they felt needed by the students and by the principal. They remarked that this was the place (the inner city) that they could make a difference, and because of their PDS experience, the urban classroom was in their "comfort zone." They expressed a very positive outlook on teaching. A consistent theme was that of continuous improvement and the importance of having dedicated teachers in urban classrooms, and the need for increased support from the community and parents. They often used the descriptor "wonderful" in describing their schools and the students with whom they worked. They also described teaching in urban schools as more demanding -- technically and emotionally -- than teaching in suburban schools.

• *What is the single most rewarding experience you have had in an urban school?*

A common theme that emerged from this question was the urban students' appreciation for the teacher. These AT&T PDS intern graduates recognized that attention, praise, hugs, treasure boxes, clothes and love are deeply valued by their students. Equally important, however, was the academic and personal growth of their students. Many cited individual scenarios of children making great strides in reading, writing, and learning to control their anger. Their (the AT&T PDS intern graduates) reward was the self-confidence of child when he/she realized his/her own success.

• *What are the strengths and weaknesses of the PDS model?*

The most frequently mentioned strength was the support of the on-site Resident Clinical Faculty. Also noted was the value of having a large number of interns at the PDS site contributed to a diversity of style, teamwork, and a real sense of camaraderie. Cited also was the fact they (PDS intern graduates) learned how to handle many kinds of discipline problems. Learning to write and implement thematic units (which actually worked) was also an important skill that was acquired at the PDS. Some PDS intern graduates noted that their portfolio was a very useful tool in demonstrating to principals what they could do in the classroom. Many have other AT&T PDS intern graduates teaching at their schools. They commented on the continued support they receive from each.

Not many weaknesses were expressed. Included as weaknesses were the competition among interns to "be the best," the split internship, the variability among directing teachers, the amount of paperwork, never having enough time, lacking the "know how" to deal with parents who didn't care and the kinds of environments students really come from, and needing more training for working with mainstreamed ESE students.

Assessing Changes in JUEP PDS Teachers' Attitudes and Impact on PDS Climate

To assess the changes in attitudes among JUEP PDS faculty and the impact on school climate, a time series design is being used. Baseline data were collected during the first year of the JUEP initiative. One hundred and twelve teachers from the JUEP PDS sites completed the JUEP School Climate Survey during Year One. Sixty teachers (approximately 85% of the combined staffs) completed the JUEP School Climate Survey at the end of Year Two.

JUEP School Climate Survey Instrument

The JUEP School Climate Survey Instrument contains 62 items; twenty-four of which were on the baseline survey conducted in 1995. Four items measures the attitudes and expectations for the JUEP initiative. Three items focused on the principal; four on the PDS students; three on parental support and involvement and the balance on JUEP PDS teachers' perceptions of the school environment and other indicators associated with school climate.

Data Analysis

In this status report, descriptive statistics were used. Cross tabs were constructed by year. Means and standard deviations were computed for each item.

Results

The cross tab tables may be found in Appendix E. There were twelve items on which the percentage of agreement increased from 1995 to 1996. There were twelve items on which the percentage of agreement decreased from 1995 to 1996. The positive and negative changes are reported in Table 5.

Table 5

Status Report Comparing JUEP School Climate Responses of 1995 and 1996

I. School Climate Survey Items with Increases in Percentage of Agreement	*% Agreement*
5. I feel that the project is realistic in light of the problems in the school district	
1995	71.4
1996	78.4
6. Teachers and principals work together to run the school effectively	
1995	95.6
1996	96.7
7. Administrators invite and listen to what teachers have to say	
1995	97.3
1996	98.3
9. Teachers, parents, and students have a voice in what happens in the school	
1995	92.7
1996	93.3
10. Students complete their homework assignments	
1995	42.8
1996	58.3
12. Students really care about this school	
1995	71.7
1996	76.7
13. Parent opinions are invited and valued in this school	
1995	94.4
1996	96.7
16. Teachers willingly spend time to help students	
1995	96.3
1996	100
20. Teachers do not have too many committee and non-teaching requirements	
1995	48.5
1996	57.7
22. The principal encourages experimentation	
1995	94.4
1996	100

I. School Climate Survey Items with Increases in Percentage of Agreement	*% Agreement*
23. Parents and the community support new curricular and instructional approaches	
1995	72.9
1996	73.4
24. I want to be assigned to this school again next year	
1995	92.5
1996	93.3

II. School Climate Survey Items with Decreases in Percentage of Agreement	*% Agreement*
1. I am still excited about our school being a part of JUEP	
1995	89.3
1996	85.0
2. I feel participating in JUEP has led to my professional development	
1995	91.0
1996	80.0
3. I feel that participation in JUEP is not waste of time	
1995	85.9
1996	83.3
4. JUEP has helped to improve the achievement of students at my school this year	
1995	90.0
1996	73.4
8. Administrators invite and listen carefully to what students have to say about the school	
1995	91.1
1996	86.7
11. Students work had to get good grades and learn at this school	
1995	66.1
1996	65.0
14. Everyone in this school is treated with respect	
1995	89.7
1996	86.7
15. Parents tend to involve themselves in the life and activities of this school	
1995	57.5
1996	45.0
17. Teachers understand and meet the needs of the students at this school	
1995	95.3
1996	91.7
18. The morale of this school staff is high	
1995	86.8
1996	85.0
19. Teachers are enthusiastic at this school	
1995	96.3
1996	91.7
21. Students respect and care about one another at this school	
1995	58.9
1996	58.4

Discussion, Conclusions, and Implications

For the past six years the Duval County Schools and the University of North Florida College of Education have been collaboratively engaged in reform initiatives that target urban schooling and the preparation of urban teachers. Each institution was experiencing a press for change. In the school district, intense public attention was being focused on the achievement gaps between low and middle income schools. Feedback from College of Education graduates made it clear that they did not feel prepared for the challenges facing urban teachers while, concomitantly, many COE graduates were being assigned to urban schools. Efforts by each institution to deal separately with its facet of this dual-edged dilemma proved to be less than satisfactory. Educators from the university and the school district came to realize that making progress would require simultaneous change across institutional boundaries as well as changes within the individual partner organizations.

The Promise of Professional Development Schools to Improve Urban Preparation and Practice

The notion of leveraging resources by transforming partner-specific problems into shared goals and then brainstorming strategies to put those goals into action provided the impetus for the professional development school collaborative ventures. Creating urban professional development schools offered a promising strategy to improve urban student achievement, the preparation of urban teachers, and the ongoing professional development of school and university based faculty.

The invitation from the AT&T Foundation to submit a collaborative proposal to redesign the preparation of urban teachers and simultaneously improve urban student achievement and the profession development of experienced educators provided the impetus and access to resources to help support the collaborative agenda. Creating urban professional development schools (PDS's) served as the central focus for the project. PDS's provided a vehicle that accommodated the inter-connections of practice, preparation, and student learning. The "professional development continuum for urban educators," developed as an organizing construct for the AT&T initiative, provided an overarching frame that encouraged changing the conditions of practice in urban schools by linking the preparation of urban teachers to urban school renewal and to student achievement. Central to our conception of PDS's was the belief that urban PDS's must be conceptualized as "emerging sites of effective practice" rather than the "exemplary sites" often described in the literature. Equal importance was given to teacher preparation for preservice teachers and professional development of experienced educators -- both school- and university-based. We viewed the PDS initiatives as opportunities for all participants to acquire new skills and collaboratively develop new knowledge bases.

Finally, changing attitudes and behaviors was viewed as a necessary condition to transforming professional practice of both school and university faculty, and "tools" were needed that could help change existing school and university cultures. The work of Little (1982), Little and

McLaughlin (1993), Fullan (1991, 1993), Lieberman (1991, 1995), and past successful collaboratives influenced the selection of seven professional norms that would serve as "design parameters" for collaborative initiatives and the use of collaborative work teams called strategic learning teams to carry out the work of restructuring.

The AT&T and JUEP PDS model is characterized by having interns organized into eighteen member cohorts assigned to each PDS site for one or two semesters. The PDS interns are then further organized into learning teams that include classroom teachers, fellow interns, and a Resident Clinical Faculty.

Impact on Interns, Beginning Teachers, and PDS Faculty

Results from this study which included both AT&T and JUEP interns, support the hypothesis that the PDS experience positively impacts the confidence levels of interns completing student teaching in urban classrooms. PDS interns reported higher confidence levels in eight dimensions of practice. This increased confidence has led to a large percentage of PDS interns actively seeking positions in urban schools, and, at this point in time, beginning teachers who have completed an urban PDS experience continue to teach in urban settings. In tracking the status of the 350 AT&T and JUEP PDS interns, 148 of 350, or 42% are currently teaching in schools where 70% or more of the students coming from low income families. An additional 74, or 21%, of the AT&T and JUEP PDS interns, are teaching in urban schools.

The attitude of urban experienced teachers also remains positive with over 80% of the JUEP PDS teachers indicating that participation in JUEP is a worthwhile initiative. Over 85% of the PDS teachers indicated morale was high and less than 3% indicated they would like a different school assignment next year. This finding is consistent with findings from the AT&T initiative: of the approximately 140 teachers at the AT&T PDS sites, only six requested a transfer during two years of implementation of the project for reasons other than moving or maternity leave.

The impact on student achievement was not assessed as part of the AT&T initiative. In the JUEP project, baseline student achievement data were collected at the end of Year One and beginning of Year Two (Year One was a planning year with full implementation beginning in Year Two). Student achievement data, along with retention and attendance rates will again be collected at the end of the 1996/97 school year.

Institutionalized PDS Components

Several AT&T and JUEP project components have been institutionalized:

• The redesigned early field experiences and preinternship experiences have been incorporated into the College's preparation programs.

• The university and school district continues to jointly fund the preinternship clinical educator positions and the internship clinical educator positions (Resident Clinical Faculty).

• Internship experiences have become more urban-focused and clustered. Every College of Education graduate is required to participate in at least one urban field experience. The professional norms are incorporated into both the preinternship and internship field components.

• Other urban schools have observed the changes at the AT&T and JUEP PDS sites and actively seek to become a PDS.

• Duval County urban principals actively recruit PDS intern graduates. Colleagues routinely call upon the PDS principals to provide recommendations for teaching positions.

• The strategic learning team process is routinely used in other collaborative initiatives.

Barriers to Progress

Finally, there were pervasive barriers that must constantly be overcome. These included

(a) the multiple opportunities for mis-communication and misunderstandings among collaborative partners and among other members of the organization not directly involved in the initiative;

(b) the challenges associated with participating in cultures that are distinctly different as the partners struggled to create shared cultures;

(c) the necessity for finding mechanisms for coping with problems arising from collaborative actions themselves;

(d) the "hidden" costs of time, money, and psychological energy needed to build capacity and change the infrastructure to accommodate new models of practice;

(e) the overloaded agendas for both school and university collaborative partners;

(f) the concern by decision-makers with balancing the funding of innovative and exciting initiatives and while also sustaining the remaining more traditional sites and programs that did not receive external funds;

(g) coming to grips with the need to create new policy tools which support restructuring

efforts rather than trying to modifying existing ones;

(h) negotiating responsibility and coming to consensus about who is responsible for what; and

(i) the difficulty in changing familiar patterns and dealing with the reluctance to move away from the traditional ways of doing things.

Even with the many complex pitfalls and obstacles to overcome, the creation of new collaborative structures and cultures can serve as an "educational linchpin" necessary to successfully transform practice, preparation, and the profession into an educational system that prepares all students and adults with the strategies and knowledge bases needed to creatively and ethically solve complex problems, adapt to rapidly changing circumstances, and excel in a culturally diverse and technologically sophisticated world. The two collaborative projects reported on in this paper, the AT&T Alliance for Tomorrow's Teachers and the Jacksonville Urban Educational Partnership (funded by the U. S. Department of Education) have proven effective beginnings in overcoming these barriers.

REFERENCES

Anderson, L. (1989). Learners and learning. In M.C. Reynolds (Ed.), Knowledge base for the beginning teacher (pp. 37-46). New York: Pergamon.

Banks, J. (1988). Multiethnic education: Theory and practice. (2nd ed.) Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Banks, J. (1989). Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Barnes, H. (1989). Structuring knowledge for beginning. In M.C. Reynolds (Ed.), Knowledge base for the beginning teacher (pp. 13-22). New York: Pergamon.

Bennett, W. (1987). What works: Research about teaching and learning. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Bereiter, C. & Scardamalia, M. (1992). Cognition and Curriculum. In Handbook of Research on Curriculum (pp. 517-542). New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Berliner, D. (1988, February). The development of expertise in pedagogy. Charles W. Hunt Lecture presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. New Orleans.

Berliner, D. (1994). Expertise: The wonder of exemplary performance, in Mangieri, J. & Black, C. (Eds.), Creating powerful thinking in teachers and students. (pp.161-185). Fort Worth: Harcourt, Brace College Publishers.

Boysen, T.C. (1992). "Irreconcilable differences: Effective urban schools versus restructuring. Education and Urban Society, 25(1), 85-95.

Christner, C. (1990). Priority schools: The third year: Effective school standards report, 1989-90. Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 323 269)

Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S. (1990). Research on teaching and teacher research: The issues that divide. Educational Researcher, 19 (3), 2-11.

Darling-Hammond, L. (Ed). (1994). Professional development schools: Schools for a developing profession. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dilworth, M. E. (Ed). (1992). Diversity in teacher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Feiman-Nemser, S. & Floden, R.E. (1986). The cultures of teaching. In M.C. Wittrock (3rd Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 502-526). New York: Macmillan.

Fine, M. (Ed). (1994). Chartering urban school reform: Reflections on public high schools in the midst of change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Florida's Commission on Education Reform and Accountability. (1992, 1993, 1994, 1995). Blueprint 2000: A system of school improvement and accountability. Tallahassee FL: Florida State Department of Education.

Fountain, C. & Evans, D. (1994). Beyond Shared Rhetoric: A collaborative change system for integrating inservice and preservice urban educational delivery systems. Journal of Teacher Education, (45).

Fullan, M. & Steigelbauer, K. (1991). The new meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Fullan, M. (1993). Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform. London: Falmer.

Fullan, M. (1993). Innovation, reform and restructuring strategies. In G. Cawelti (Ed), Challenges and achievements of American education (pp. 23-42). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Goodlad, J. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw Hill.

Goodlad, J. (1990). Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Grant, C. & Koslela, R. (1986). Education that is multicultural and the relationship between preservice and campus learning and field experience. Journal of Educational Research, 79(4), 197-204

Hall, G., & Hord, S. (1987). Change in schools: Facilitating the process. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Hess, A. (1995). Restructuring urban schools: A chicago perspective. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hodgkinson, H. (1991). The leaky roof. Phi Delta Kappan, 73 (9-16).

Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group, Inc.

Holmes Group, (1990). Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group, Inc.

Holmes Group, (1995). Tomorrow's Schools of Education. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group, Inc.

Hord, S., Rutherford, W.L., Huling-Austin, L. & Hall, G. (1987). Taking charge of change. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Hord, S., Rutherford, W.L., Huling-Austin, L. & Hall, G. (1987). Taking charge of change. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. (1995). Model standards for beginning teacher licensing and development: A resource for state dialogue. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Joyce, B., Showers, B., & Bennett, B. (1987). Synthesis of research on staff development: A framework for future study and a state-of-art analysis. Educational Leadership, 45(3), 77-87.

Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (1988). Student achievement through staff development. New York: Longman.

Kennedy, M. (1987). Inexact sciences: Professional education and the development of expertise (Issue Paper 87-2). East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Education.

Kennedy, M. (1989). Reflections and the problem of professional standards. Colloquy, 2(2), 1-6.

Kennedy, M. (1991). Policy issues in teacher education. East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Education.

Kozol, J. (1991). Savage inequalities. New York: Crown.

Leithwood, K. (1990). The principal's role in teacher development. In B. Joyce (Ed.), Changing school culture through staff development. (pp. 71-90). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum.

Levine, D.U. (1991). Creating effective schools: Findings and implications form research and practice. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(5), 389-393.

Levine, D.U. & Lezotte, L.W. (1990). Unusually effective schools: A review and analysis of research and practice. Madison, WI: National Center for Effective Schools Research and Development. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 330 032.

Lezotte, L.W. & Jacoby, B. (Eds.). (1991). Effective school practices that work. ED 359 649

Lieberman, A. & Miller, L. (Eds). (1991). Staff development for education in the '90s: New demands, new realities, new perspectives. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lieberman, A. (Ed.). (1995). The work of restructuring schools: building from the ground up. New York: Teachers College Press.

Little, J. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. American Educational Research Journal, 19 (3), 325-340.

Little, J. & McLaughlin, M., ed. (1993). Teachers' work: Individuals, colleagues, and contexts. New York: Teachers College, Columbia, University.

Loucks-Horsley, S. (1989). Managing change: An integrated part of staff development. In S.

Caldwell (Ed.), Staff development: A handbook of effective practices (pp. 114-125). Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council

Loucks-Horsley, S., & Cox, P.L. (1985). What the national commission and studies of education overlooked: The "how" of school change. Journal of Staff Development, 5 (2), 21-28.

Louis, K., & Simsek, H. (1991, October). Paradigm shifts and organizational learning: Some theoretical lessons for restructuring schools. paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Baltimore, MD.

Mayher,J. S. & Brause, R. S. (1991). The never-ending cycle of teacher growth, In P.S. Brause & J.S. Mayher (Eds.), Search and research: What the inquiring teacher needs to know (pp. 23-44). London: Falmer Press.

Murphy, J. (1991). Restructuring schools: Capturing and assessing the phenomenon. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (1994). What teachers should know and be able to do. Detroit: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (1991). Professional standards for teaching mathematics. Reston, VA: Author.

National Science Teachers Association. (1990). A NSTA position statement: Elementary school science. Washington, D.C.: Author

O'Hair, M. & Odell, S. (1995). Educating teachers for leadership and change: Teacher education yearbook III. Thousand Oaks, CA: Crown Press, Inc.

O'Hara-Devereauz, M. & Johanse, R. (1994). Globalwork: Building distance, culture, and time. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Pophewitz, T. (1988). Educational reform: Rhetoric, ritual, and social interest. Educational Theory, 38 (1), 77-93.

Pultorak, E. (1993). Facilitating reflective thought in novice teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 44(4), 288-295.

Reilly, D. H. (1989). A knowledge base for education: Cognitive science. Journal of Teacher Education, 40(3), 9-13.

Rendon, L. & Hope, R. (1996). Educating a new majority: Transforming america's educational system for diversity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Resnick, L. & Knopfer, L. (Eds.) (1989). Toward the thinking curriculum: Current cognitive research. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Sallis, E. (1993). Total quality management in education. London: Kogan Page Limited.

Sarason, S. (1993). The case for change: Rethinking the preparation of educators. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sarason, S. (1995). School change: The personal development of a point of view. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schlechty, P.C. (1990). Schools for the 21st century: Leadership imperatives for educational reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schon, D. (1987). Educating the reflective practitioner. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills. (1991). What work requires of schools: A SCANS report for America 2000. Washington, DC: Department of Labor.

Senge, P. (1990). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. New York: Doubleday.

Shulman, L. (1986). Those who understand knowledge growth in teaching. Educational Researcher, 15 (2), 4-14.

Shulman, l. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard Educational Review, 57, 1-22.

Tabachnich, B.R. & Zeichner, K. (eds). (1991). Issues and practices in inquiry-oriented teacher education. London: Falmer Press.

Wehlage, G., Smith, G., & Lipman, P. (1992). Restructuring urban schools: The new futures experience. American Educational Research Journal, 29 (1), 51-93.

Wilson, K. & Daviss, B. (1994). Redesigning education. New York: Henry Holt and Company, Inc.

Zeichner, K. (1988). Understanding the character and quality of the academic and professional components of teacher education (Research Report 88-1). East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Education.

Zeichner, K. & Liston, D. (1990). Traditions of reform in U.S. teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 41 (2), 3-20.

Zeichner, K., Melnick, S., & Gomez, M. (Eds). (1996). Currents of reform in preservice teacher education. New York: Teachers College Press.

Zimpher, N.L. & Ashburn, E.A. (1992). Countering parochialism in teacher candidates. In M.E. Dilworth (Ed.), Diversity in teacher education. (pp. 40-62). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

APPENDIX A

(A Comparison of AT/T and Non-AT/T Spring 1994 College of Education Internship Survey (Perceptions of Confidence Levels in Eight Dimensions)

Comparison of AT&T and Non-AT&T Spring 1994 College of Education Internship Survey (Perceptions of current confidence levels in 8 dimensions)

CONFIDENCE	AT&T Interns	Non-AT&T	F value	p value
1. Planning Dimension (9 items)				
-Determine what to teach	4.62	4.53	0.62	NS
-Collaboratively develop/implement learning experiences with other teachers	4.81	4.57	5.78	.018
-Plan effective classroom activities	4.74	4.74	0.01	NS
-Routinely diagnose mistakes students make and use information to design subsequent learning experiences	4.52	4.24	4.87	.029
-Find time and resources to plan for effective learning presentations	4.71	4.56	1.76	NS
-Plan complex problems for students to tackle and develop support materials	4.62	4.24	6.49	.012
-Provide reinforcement, supplemental, and remedial activities	4.71	4.47	3.74	NS
-Ensure learning activities have purpose, require action and participation by all students and include student-to-student and student-to-teacher conversations	4.90	4.71	5.10	.026
-Incorporate media and technical resources into lessons	4.83	4.59	5.23	.024
2. Instruction Dimension (24 items)				
-Motivate students to solve complex problems	4.64	4.36	5.69	.019
-Get students to demonstrate how to interpret what they learn	4.64	4.52	0.89	NS
-Get students to relate what they learn to what else students know	4.74	4.56	2.24	NS
-Have in-depth knowledge of subject matter will be teaching	4.74	4.42	6.95	.009
-Get students actively involved in producing knowledge rather than regurgitating knowledge	4.79	4.47	6.96	.009
-Make appropriate assignments	4.74	4.81	0.66	NS
-Adapt learning experiences to meet special learning needs of all students	4.81	4.33	15.96	.000
-Routinely plan/implement thematic units which integrate various subject matter	4.86	4.47	9.39	.003

CONFIDENCE	AT&T Interns	Non-AT&T	F value	p value
2. Instruction Dimension (24 items) CONTINUED				
-Present subject matter in ways which routinely pay attention to students' prior knowledge and learning style	4.86	4.58	7.50	.007
-Assist students who are unable to do class work	4.86	4.64	4.14	.044
-Create/ sustain a learning environment for at-risk student which insures those students' success	4.83	4.27	26.02	.000
-Facilitate class discussions which include all students	4.88	4.76	1.78	NS
-Integrate higher order thinking skills into daily curriculum	4.79	4.58	4.18	.043
-Stimulate student interest	4.88	4.80	1.24	NS
-Motivate at-risk students	4.76	4.47	6.20	.014
-Present material in logical and sequential fashion	4.86	4.66	3.83	NS
-Get students excited about a subject area or topic	4.79	4.81	0.10	NS
-Use integrated instructional activities	4.93	4.75	5.81	.018
-Get students engaged in conversations about experiences where they interpret and analyze what they have learned	4.74	4.64	0.72	NS
-Diagnose learning styles of students and adapt instructional delivery to meet those needs	4.81	4.19	17.65	.000
-Use cooperative and team learning as a primary instructional delivery strategy	4.76	4.38	8.47	.004
-Design and use instructional strategies which result in changed student perceptions of their abilities and potential for achievement	4.81	4.39	12.40	.001
-Routinely use technology to deliver instruction	4.74	4.46	3.49	NS
-Create learning environments where students demonstrate curiosity and positive attitudes toward learning	4.93	4.75	4.06	.047
3. Time Management (12 items)				
-Assess students' work using alternative assessment strategies	4.76	4.44	4.63	.034
-Schedule parent conferences	4.76	4.29	8.30	.005
-Successfully conduct parent conferences	4.57	4.14	6.30	.014
-Attend and participate in school/grade level meetings	4.90	4.73	3.23	NS

CONFIDENCE	AT&T Interns	Non-AT&T	F value	p value
3. Time Management (12 items) CONTINUED				
-Establish, teach and reinforce classroom rules	4.86	4.86	0.01	NS
-Take the lead in working and planning cooperatively with fellow teachers	4.83	4.56	6.00	.016
--Establish collegial relationships with more experienced teachers	4.81	4.76	0.22	NS
-Complete routine paper work such as cum folders, IEP's, attendance, etc	4.74	4.44	4.60	.034
-Initiate the referral process for students with special needs	4.67	4.12	11.96	.001
-Work with children in small groups or individually	4.90	4.81	1.22	NS
-Organize my classroom into a learning community where every member participates in learning process and shares what they have learned	4.83	4.81	0.05	NS
-Articulate the personal qualities I promote in my classroom	4.90	4.83	0.96	NS
4. Classroom Management (13 items)				
-Control behavior of all types of students	4.50	4.74	0.03	NS
-Analyze student behavior using the student's cultural background	4.76	4.41	7.69	.007
-Analyze my reaction to student behavior from my cultural background	4.81	4.46	8.10	.005
-Reinforce classroom rules using a variety of strategies	4.88	4.81	0.72	NS
-Articulate the rationale for classroom rules	4.90	4.80	1.87	NS
-Articulate the rationale for consequences I choose	4.90	4.76	2.68	NS
-Deal with unmotivated students	4.60	4.58	0.03	NS
-Demonstrate to students that I have high expectations for them in ways other than telling them	4.86	4.67	4.09	.045
-Handle disruptive students regardless of their backgrounds	4.57	4.53	0.10	NS
-Effectively manage off-task behavior	4.57	4.63	0.23	NS
-Identify multiple explanations for problems that emerge in my classroom	4.76	4.58	3.22	NS
-Recognize and reward on-task behavior of students	4.90	4.85	0.52	NS
-Implement cooperative learning strategies	4.83	4.75	0.98	NS

CONFIDENCE continued	AT&T Interns	Non-AT&T	F value	p value
5. Student Diversity (8 items)				
-Routinely integrate multicultural education into daily classroom activities	4.74	4.37	7.73	.007
-Teach diverse ethnic groups of students	4.88	4.32	20.35	.000
-Identify/ describe the impact different cultures have on student learning	4.76	4.34	9.29	.003
-Plan for/ instruct students with special needs in regular classrooms	4.76	4.47	6.20	.014
-Instruct students with a wide range of academic levels and abilities	4.83	4.49	10.68	.002
-Identify/explain differences among learners and implications for teaching from at least 2 different cultural perspectives	4.76	4.27	15.69	.000
-Measure student learning	4.95	4.59	14.15	.000
-Treat all students with dignity and respect	5.00	4.97	1.44	NS
6. Reflective Thought (13 items)				
-Critically question observed methods and procedures for teaching	4.88	4.64	5.70	.019
-Analyze from at least 2 perspectives a common teaching dilemma	4.90	4.51	12.56	.001
-Brainstorm possible solutions to difficulties encountered in the classroom	4.95	4.76	7.92	.006
-Articulate my personal belief about teaching, learning and the roles related to teaching	4.90	4.80	1.87	NS
--Share the results of what I learn about teaching and learning going on in my classroom with other teachers in my school	4.86	4.75	1.64	NS
-Identify the discrepancies between theoretical knowledge personal, and practical knowledge encountered in the classroom	4.86	4.46	12.20	.001
-Accept and consider feedback you receive from other professionals	4.83	4.81	0.05	NS
-Implement action-research project in my classroom that will help me improve my practice	4.76	4.44	6.91	.009
-Modify teaching practices based on student performance	4.95	4.73	7.80	.006

CONFIDENCE	AT&T Interns	Non-AT&T	F value	p value
6. Reflective Thought (13 items) CONTINUED				
-Routinely ask myself the question, Why do I do the things the way I do? and can I articulate the rationale for those decisions	4.81	4.71	1.03	NS
-Analyze teaching in videotaped episode by describing purpose, explain judgments made, articulate rationale for decisions, modify actions	4.86	4.53	5.42	.022
-Plan for your own teaching improvement	4.93	4.90	0.27	NS
-Continue to experiment and improve practice throughout my professional career	4.93	4.92	0.06	NS
7. Efficacy (5 items)				
-No statistically significant differences between AT&T interns and non-AT&T interns were found				
-Create classroom environments that are characterized by sense of community (mutual respect, trust and responsibility)	4.98	4.88	2.30	NS
-Actively overcome obstacles to creating learning communities arising from the fact that often teachers and students do not share a common cultural social outlook	4.85	4.66	3.34	NS
-Assume responsibility for questioning "what is" and actively seeking alternative ways of managing learning	4.85	4.66	3.79	NS
-Experiment with different teaching strategies	4.80	4.78	0.08	NS
-Create and experiment with new ways to organize students and schedule the school day	4.80	4.76	0.22	NS
8. Accepting a Position and Succeeding in a Classroom in a:				
-Inner city elementary school	4.71	3.90	17.21	.000
-Suburban elementary school	4.88	4.72	2.80	NS
-Rural elementary school	4.86	4.85	0.01	NS
-Affluent elementary school	4.74	4.54	2.40	NS
-School which includes a large number of exceptional education students	4.40	3.98	5.20	.025
-School in which all exceptional education students are mainstreamed into regular classrooms	4.43	3.92	7.04	.009
-School which organizes students into multi-aged classrooms	4.45	3.83	9.33	.003
-School which eliminates traditional grades and uses continuous progress curriculum	4.51	4.19	3.10	NS

APPENDIX B

A Comparison of JUEP and Non-JUEP Spring 1996 College of Education Internship Survey (Perceptions of Confidence Levels in Nine Dimensions)

JUEP and Non JUEP INTERN SURVEY RESULTS
SPRING 1996

Cluster 1: Planning	JUEP MEAN	JUEP SD	NON JUEP MEAN	NON JUEP SD	F RATIO	F PROB
Identify long-range goals for a given subject area. (1)	4.50	.70	4.25	.76	2.98	.07
Construct and sequence related short range objectives for a given subject area. (2)	4.72	.51	4.64	.59	.53	.47
Determine the entry level knowledge and/or skills of students for a given set of instructional objectives using diagnostic tests, student portfolios, teaching observations, etc. (3)	4.0	.76	4.15	.87	.77	.38
Use assessment information to change and adapt the curriculum as the year progresses. (4)	4.25	.77	4.19	.78	.15	.70
Routinely diagnose mistakes students make and use this information to design future learning experiences. (5)	4.56	.61	4.36	.69	2.19	.14
Ensure learning activities have a purpose, require action and participation by all students and include student-to -student and teacher-to -students conversations. (6)	4.64	.93	4.47	.72	1.15	.29
Incorporate technology-based activities into lessons. (7)	4.44	.97	4.29	.97	.63	.43
Use the computer to keep my grades, prepare worksheets, and carry out other administrative tasks.(8)	4.47	.81	4.34	.98	.54	.46

Cluster 2: Instruction	JUEP MEAN	JUEP SD	NON JUEP MEAN	NON JUEP SD	F RATIO	F PROB
Motivate students to solve complex problems. (9)	4.44	.94	4.21	.71	2.22	.14
Ensure that students demonstrate how to apply what they learn to new situations. (10)	4.53	.65	4.31	.67	2.65	.11
Take responsibility for what students learn and how well they learn. (11)	4.72	.51	4.55	.60	2.25	.14
Have in-depth knowledge of the subject matter that I will be teaching. (12)	4.69	.58	4.57	.56	1.18	.28
Get students actively involved in producing knowledge rather than replicating predetermined set of facts. (13)	4.53	.56	4.28	.77	3.05	.08
Know how to select and use at least three pieces of instructional software. (14)	4.33	1.10	4.12	1.17	.86	.36
Adapt learning experiences to meet learning needs of all students. (15)	4.42	.60	4.21	.71	2.26	.14
Routinely plan and implement thematic units which integrate various subject matter disciplines. (16)	4.72	.57	4.34	.77	7.41	.01
Communicate effectively using verbal and non-verbal skills with diverse students. (17)	4.67	.93	4.56	.66	.51	.48
Help students understand how their beliefs about themselves influence their learning. (18)	4.50	.91	4.29	.83	1.52	.22
Experiment with different teaching strategies. (19)	4.75	.44	4.51	.64	4.38	.04
Use instructional strategies which help at-risk students value their own abilities and strengthen their beliefs they can succeed. (20)	4.56	.61	4.27	.75	4.13	.04
Construct tests, portfolios, and other tasks to measure student achievement of objectives and to assess student progress. (21)	4.64	.54	4.52	.62	1.05	.31
Giving urban learners a great deal of input into the classroom. (22)	4.53	.94	4.12	.94	4.74	.03
Regularly use classroom time on the acquisition and development of higher-order thinking skills. (23)	4.39	.60	4.29	.71	.52	.47
Motivate at-risk students to achieve at higher levels. (24)	4.50	.65	4.12	.77	6.70	.01
Diagnose the learning needs and styles of students and adapt instructional delivery to meet those needs. (25)	4.44	.69	4.20	.74	2.83	.09
Use cooperative and team learning as primary instructional delivery strategies. (26)	4.83	.45	4.43	.78	8.57	.00
Create learning environments where all students, including at-risk students, demonstrate curiosity and positive attitudes toward learning. (27)	4.61	.55	4.47	.60	1.43	.23
Create learning tasks in which student must demonstrate how what they learn is related to what they already know. (28)	4.58	.55	4.44	.81	.97	.33
Assess students' work using alternative assessment strategies. (29)	4.50	.61	4.30	.71	2.11	.15
Can name at least five community agencies which offer assistance to urban children. (30)	3.22	1.38	3.31	1.13	.15	.70
Successfully confer with parents of diverse cultures. (31)	4.67	.48	4.13	.91	11.09	.00

Cluster 3: Instructional Management/ Ongoing Inquiry	JUEP MEAN	JUEP SD	NON JUEP MEAN	NON JUEP SD	F RATIO	F PROB
Inform parents of students progress using a variety of channels *other than* report cards. (32)	4.75	.50	4.46	.74	4.64	.03
Recognize that urban teachers can't do much regarding students' motivation and performance because learning depends on the home environment. (33)	2.00	1.47	2.24	1.44	.68	.41
Initiate and complete the referral process for students with special needs. (34)	3.72	.85	3.61	1.11	.31	.58
Continue to experiment and improve my practice each year. (35)	4.97	.17	4.76	.45	7.18	.01
Strengthen my professional growth by enrolling in university courses. (36)	4.86	.42	4.57	.92	3.27	.07
Enhance my professional growth by participating in professional education activities. (37)	4.92	.28	4.73	.54	3.87	.05

Cluster 4: Classroom Management	JUEP MEAN	JUEP SD	NON JUEP MEAN	NON JUEP SD	F RATIO	F PROB
Establish, teach, and reinforce classroom rules that results in increased on-task student behavior and positive atmosphere. (38)	4.69	.47	4.53	.64	1.99	.16
Deal with misconduct, interruptions, intrusions, and digressions in ways that promote instructional momentum. (39)	4.64	.49	4.38	.72	3.90	.05
Analyze student behavior using the student's cultural background. (40)	4.50	.51	4.01	.87	9.91	.00
Analyze my reaction to student behavior from my own cultural background. (41)	4.42	.73	4.16	.93	2.24	.14
Demonstrate to students that I have high expectations for them in ways *other than* telling them. (42)	4.64	.59	4.55	.64	.51	.48
Handle disruptive students regardless of their backgrounds. (43)	4.64	.54	4.69	.54	.19	.66
Recognize overt signs of serve emotional distress in students and know the appropriate interventions and referral procedures. (44)	4.28	.70	4.01	.86	2.72	.10
Recognize signs of alcohol and drug abuse is students and knows ways of appropriate intervention and referral procedures. (45)	4.22	.76	3.92	.98	2.73	.10
Recognize the overt physical and behavioral indicators of child abuse and neglect; know the rights and responsibilities regarding reporting and how to interact appropriately with a child after a report has been made. (46)	4.39	.80	4.02	.94	4.21	.04

Cluster 5: Diversity	JUEP MEAN	JUEP SD	NON JUEP MEAN	NON JUEP SD	F RATIO	F PROB
Plan and implement multicultural lessons. (47)	4.83	.38	4.40	.67	13.05	.00
Effectively teach diverse ethnic groups of students. (48)	4.64	.90	4.49	.64	1.02	.31
Can identify subtle forms of racism including unintentional cultural bias that might influence my teaching. (49)	4.53	.77	4.47	.59	.19	.66
Identify and describe the impact different cultures have on student learning. (50)	4.47	.91	4.30	.74	1.16	.28
Plan for and instruct students with special needs within the regular classroom. (51)	4.03	1.25	4.03	.90	.00	.98
Instruct students with a wide range of academic styles, levels and abilities. (52)	4.56	.61	4.47	.66	.43	.51
Raise questions about multicultural and inclusion issues in a variety of settings (e.g. with peers, with directing teachers). (53)	4.56	.56	4.19	.78	6.48	.01
Identify and explain differences among learners and implications for teaching from at least two different cultural perspectives. (54)	4.39	.77	4.09	.70	4.42	.04
Am able to change my teaching when students have difficulty. (55)	4.81	.40	4.62	.65	2.60	.11
Enhance students' feelings of dignity, self-worth, and the worth of people from other ethic, cultural, linguistic and economic groups. (56)	4.83	.38	4.63	.55	4.14	.04
Overcome obstacles to creating learning communities arising from the fact that often teachers and students do not share a common cultural/ social outlook. (57)	4.64	.49	4.40	.69	3.48	.06

Cluster 6: Reflective Thought	JUEP MEAN	JUEP SD	NON JUEP MEAN	NON JUEP SD	F RATIO	F PROB
Critically question the methods and procedures I chose for teaching. (58)	4.69	.47	4.48	.79	2.28	.13
Analyze from at least two perspectives a problem you experience during the school year. (59)	4.72	.51	4.43	.69	5.39	.02
Identify the discrepancies between theoretical knowledge and personal, practice-based knowledge you encounter in the classroom. (60)	4.58	.65	4.45	.77	.85	.36
Implement action- research project(s) in my classroom that will help me with my practice. (61)	4.39	.73	4.18	.73	2.10	.15
Question the effects of your teaching behaviors on various groups and individuals in your classroom. (62)	4.72	.45	4.48	.59	4.81	.03
Analyze my teaching in a videotaped episode by describing my purpose, explain what judgement I made, articulate the rationale for those decisions, and predict how to modify future actions. (63)	4.58	.91	4.10	1.00	6.27	.01
Identify the values being promoted in the school and discuss them with other teachers. (64)	4.75	.50	4.43	.66	7.07	.01
Plan for my own teaching improvement and act on those plans. (65)	4.94	.23	4.63	.53	11.75	.00
Modify my teaching practices based on my students' performance. (66)	4.86	.35	4.78	.67	.53	.47

Assume responsibility for questioning "what is"and actively seek alternative ways of managing learning in my classroom, (67)	4.83	.38	4.51	.59	9.61	.00

Cluster 7: Collegiality	**JUEP MEAN**	**JUEP SD**	**NON JUEP MEAN**	**NON JUEP SD**	**F RATIO**	**F PROB**
Take the lead in working and planning cooperatively with other teachers. (68)	4.72	.51	4.35	.89	5.55	.02
Actively seek to develop and team teach lessons and/ or units with fellow teachers. (69)	4.75	.44	4.39	.79	6.47	.01
Analyze current educational research and assimilate it into my teaching. (70)	4.64	.49	4.40	.67	3.63	.06
Discuss classroom difficulties (academic and management) and possible solutions with other teachers. (71)	4.86	.35	4.69	.54	3.30	.07
Take the lead in working and planning cooperatively with other teachers. (72)	4.69	.52	4.31	.81	6.81	.01
Exchange my career choice as a teacher for another field if I had the opportunity. (73)	2.03	1.42	2.29	1.46	.86	.36

Cluster 8: My Internship Experience...	JUEP MEAN	JUEP SD	NON JUEP MEAN	NON JUEP SD	F RATIO	F PROB
Altered my beliefs about what urban schools and classrooms are like. (74)	3.94	1.33	3.38	1.39	4.28	.04
Increased my confidence in my ability to be a successful urban teacher. (75)	4.39	.90	3.85	1.20	5.80	.02
Established a professional network that will continue to communicate and interact next semester/ year. (76)	4.56	.69	4.21	1.12	2.89	.09
Strengthen my commitment to teach in an urban classroom. (77)	4.25	1.02	3.51	1.16	11.27	.00
Help me acquire a better understanding of urban students and their families and how that might affect their learning. (78)	4.67	.63	3.91	1.16	13.54	.00
Provided the necessary training/ experiences to be an effective urban teacher and understanding of the capabilities of urban children and how to "tap"them. (79)	4.44	.81	3.53	1.22	17.30	.00
Demonstrated that all students can master challenging content. (80)	4.50	.77	4.19	.88	3.39	.07

Cluster 9: Accept a Teaching Position and Succeed in a Classroom in an....	JUEP MEAN	JUEP SD	NON JUEP MEAN	NON JUEP SD	F RATIO	F PROB
inner city school. (81)	4.42	.81	3.45	1.58	12.15	.00
suburban school. (82)	4.83	.85	4.49	1.00	3.20	.08
rural school. (83)	4.33	.93	4.52	.85	1.13	.29
affluent school. (84)	4.42	.69	4.30	.87	.48	.49
school with a large number of exceptional education students. (85)	3.94	.95	3.98	.97	.03	.86
school in which ESE students are mainstreamed into regular classrooms. (86)	4.03	.77	4.07	1.10	.04	.84
school which organizes students into multi-aged classrooms. (87)	4.06	1.12	3.85	1.08	.87	.35
school which eliminates traditional grades and uses continuous progress. (88)	3.92	1.27	3.69	1.44	.70	.40

APPENDIX C

Jacksonville Urban Educational Partnership
Urban Beginning Teacher Survey

II. Professional Norms - On the following scale please circle the number that best represents the degree to which you are carrying out these tasks. Begin each sentence with "I".

	Never	Seldom	Frequently	Usually	Routinely
	1	2	3	4	5
I...					
1. Take the lead in working/planning cooperatively with fellow teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Collaboratively develop/implement learning experiences with fellow teachers on a regular basis.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Work toward building a learning community within my school.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Establish a professional network outside of my school.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Establish collegial relationships with other more experienced teachers.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Critically question methods and procedures I use for teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Analyze from at least two perspectives a problem I have experienced during the year.	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
8. Brainstorm possible solutions to difficulties I encounter in the classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Identify the discrepancies between theoretical knowledge and personal, practiced-based, knowledge I encounter in my classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Implement action-research project(s) in my classroom that will help me with my practice.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Modify my teaching practices based on my student's performance.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Routinely integrate multicultural education into daily classroom activities.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Effectively teach diverse ethnic groups of students.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Identify and describe the impact different cultures have on student learning in my classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Plan for and instruct students with special needs within my regular classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Instruct students with a wide range of academic levels and abilities.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Help students understand how their beliefs about themselves influence their learning.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Plan for my own teaching improvement and act on those plans.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Take responsibility for what students learn and how well they learn.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Overcome obstacles to creating learning communities arising from the fact that often teachers and students do not share a common cultural and social outlook.	1	2	3	4	5

On the following scale please circle the number that best represents the degree to which you are carrying out these tasks. Begin each sentence with "I".

I...	Never 1	Seldom 2	Frequently 3	Usually 4	Routinely 5
21. Create and experiment with new ways to organize students and schedule the school day.	1	2	3	4	5
22. Experiment with different teaching strategies.	1	2	3	4	5
23. Assume responsibility for questioning "what is" and actively seek alternative ways of managing learning in my classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
24. .Design/use new instructional strategies which result in changed student perceptions of their abilities and their potential.	1	2	3	4	5
25. Analyze current educational research and assimilate it into my teaching.	1	2	3	4	5
26. Continue to experiment and improve my practice each year.	1	2	3	4	5
27. Strengthen my professional growth by enrolling in university courses.	1	2	3	4	5
28. Enhance my professional growth by participating in professional education activities.	1	2	3	4	5
29. Am good at persuading and motivating other teachers in my school.	1	2	3	4	5
30. Have a good understanding of my children's cultural backgrounds.	1	2	3	4	5

III. <u>Instructional Strategies</u> - On the following scale please circle the number that best represents the degree to which you are using these instructional strategies.

I...	Never 1	Seldom 2	Frequently 3	Usually 4	Routinely 5
31. Diagnose the learning needs and learning styles of my students and I adapt my instructional delivery to meet those needs.	1	2	3	4	5
32. Integrate higher order thinking skills into the daily curriculum.	1	2	3	4	5
33. Use cooperative and team learning as primary instructional delivery strategies.	1	2	3	4	5
34. Routinely use different kinds of technologies in the daily instructional activities taking place in my classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
35. Use instructional strategies which help students value their own abilities and strengthen their beliefs they can succeed.	1	2	3	4	5
36. Use the computer to keep my grades, prepare worksheets, and carry out other administrative tasks.	1	2	3	4	5

On the following scale please circle the number that best represents the degree to which you are using these instructional strategies.

I...	Never 1	Seldom 2	Frequently 3	Usually 4	Routinely 5
37. Know how to select and use at least three pieces of instructional software.	1	2	3	4	5
38. Demonstrate to each student that I appreciate him/her as an individual.	1	2	3	4	5
39. Demonstrate to students that I care about them.	1	2	3	4	5
40. Use a variety of strategies for presenting content.	1	2	3	4	5
41. Am able to change my teaching when students have difficulty.	1	2	3	4	5
42. Use materials from a variety of cultural perspectives.	1	2	3	4	5
43. Set high standards for myself.	1	2	3	4	5
44. Help students meet high standards.	1	2	3	4	5

IV. On the following scale please circle the number that best represents the degree to which you AGREE with the following statements.

	Low Agreement 1	2	3	4	High Agreement 5
45. An urban educator is very limited in what he/she can achieve because a student's home environment is a larger influence on achievement.	1	2	3	4	5
46. I understand the needs of urban children.	1	2	3	4	5
47. I feel confident in implementing cooperative learning activities with urban children and frequently do so.	1	2	3	4	5
48. When an urban student is having difficulty with an assignment, I am able to adjust the assignment to his/her needs.	1	2	3	4	5
49. My understanding of resiliency and environmental factors influences the way I teach in an urban classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
50. I can name at least five community agencies which offer assistance to urban children in my school.	1	2	3	4	5
51. Urban teachers should be cautious in adopting teaching strategies which give urban students greater input into what happens in the class.	1	2	3	4	5
52. Given the choice, I would select to teach in an urban classroom.	1	2	3	4	5

On the following scale please circle the number that best represents the degree to which you AGREE with the following statements.

	Low Agreement 1	2	3	4	High Agreement 5
53. Resiliency is often used to describe successful urban children.	1	2	3	4	5
54. If an urban student becomes noisy or disruptive, I feel assured that I know some techniques to get him/her back "on task".	1	2	3	4	5
55. I am confident in my ability to teach in an urban classroom.	1	2	3	4	5
56. When working with urban students, teachers should focus a majority of their instruction on "basic" objectives and skill development.	1	2	3	4	5
57. When students work in groups, the teacher can't really evaluate their work.	1	2	3	4	5
58. Teachers in urban schools should rely primarily on teacher-directed, focused, whole group instruction.	1	2	3	4	5
59. Good teachers create their own lessons and materials.	1	2	3	4	5
60. The most important job of teachers is to encourage students to think about questioning the world around them.	1	2	3	4	5
61. The most important job of teachers is to teach content.	1	2	3	4	5
62. I have few discipline problems with my students.	1	2	3	4	5
63. I am sure teaching will be my life-long career.	1	2	3	4	5
64. I look forward to coming to school each day.	1	2	3	4	5
65. There are some urban students who are unreachable.	1	2	3	4	5
66. Past achievement is the best indicator of how well students will perform in school.	1	2	3	4	5
67. For effective learning to take place, I need to be in control of the activities.	1	2	3	4	5

V. Please complete the following sentences

68. My teaching _____
69. Urban Schools _____
_____
70. Urban students _____
_____
71. Teachers in urban schools _____
_____
72. Ten years from now I _____

APPENDIX D

Urban Beginning Teacher Survey
(A Comparison Between AT/T PDS Intern Graduates and Non-PDS Beginning Teachers)

17-JUN-96 FOLLOW UP RESEARCH ON ATT GRADUATES JUNE 15, 1996
T-TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT SAMPLES OF ATTINTER
GROUP 1 - ATTINTER EQ 1: YES
GROUP 2 - ATTINTER EQ 2: NO

VARIABLE		NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB.	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB
V1	TAKE LEAD IN WORKING									
	GROUP 1	54	4.0185	1.055	.144	1.09	.748	2.44	105	.016
	GROUP 2	53	3.5094	1.103	.151					
V2	COLLABORATELY DEVELOP LEARNING EXPERIENCES									
	GROUP 1	53	3.8868	1.086	.149	1.09	.755	2.15	105	.034
	GROUP 2	54	3.4444	1.040	.142					
V3	WORK TOWARD BUILDING A LEARNING COMMUNITY									
	GROUP 1	54	4.2222	.833	.120	1.14	.636	2.40	108	.018
	GROUP 2	56	3.8036	.942	.126					
V4	ESTABLISH PROFESSIONAL NEWTWORK									
	GROUP 1	53	3.4340	1.152	.158	1.31	.324	-.66	107	.508
	GROUP 2	56	3.5714	1.006	.134					
V5	ESTABLISH COLLEGIAL RELATIONSHIPS									
	GROUP 1	54	4.1111	1.022	.139	1.25	.416	-.45	109	.657
	GROUP 2	57	4.1930	.915	.121					
V6	CRITICALLY QUESTIONS METHODS AND PROCEDURES									
	GROUP 1	54	4.2037	.833	.113	1.07	.804	.05	108	.964
	GROUP 2	56	4.1964	.862	.115					
V7	ANALYZE FROM TWO PERSPECTIVES A PROBLEM									
	GROUP 1	51	4.000	.917	.128	1.25	.418	.09	106	.926
	GROUP 2	57	3.9825	1.026	.136					

17-JUN-96 FOLLOW UP RESEARCH ON ATT GRADUATES JUNE 15, 1996
T-TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT SAMPLES OF ATTINTER
GROUP 1 - ATTINTER EQ 1: YES
GROUP 2 - ATTINTER EQ 2: NO

VARIABLE		NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB.	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB.
V8	BRAINSTORM POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS TO DIFFICULTY									
	GROUP 1	50	4.2600	.922	.130	1.29	.358	-.36	104	.716
	GROUP 2	56	4.3214	.811	.108					
V9	IDENTIFY DISCREPENCIES BETWEEN THEORETIC									
	GROUP 1	53	3.9811	.888	.122	1.34	.292	-.01	108	.994
	GROUP 2	57	3.9825	1.026	.136					
V10	IMPLEMENT ACTION RESEARCH PROJECTS									
	GROUP 1	53	3.4528	1.280	.176	1.02	.942	-.05	107	.963
	GROUP 2	56	3.4643	1.293	.173					
V11	MODIFY TEACHING PRACTICES									
	GROUP 1	54	4.3333	1.009	.137	1.45	.176	.70	109	.486
	GROUP 2	57	4.2105	.840	.111					
V12	INTEGRATE MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION INTO									
	GROUP 1	54	3.7593	.950	.129	1.07	.816	-1.12	109	.265
	GROUP 2	57	3.9649	.981	.130					
V13	EFFECTIVELY TEACH DIVERSE ETHNIC GROUPS									
	GROUP 1	53	3.6792	1.312	.180	1.62	..077	-2.37	105	.020
	GROUP 2	57	4.2105	1.031	.136					
V14	IDENTIFY IMPACT DIFFERENT CULTURES HAVE									
	GROUP 1	52	3.7500	1.007	.140	1.54	.121	-.72	105	.472
	GROUP 2	55	3.9091	1.251	.169					

17-JUN-96 FOLLOW UP RESEARCH ON ATT GRADUATES JUNE 15, 1996
T-TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT SAMPLES OF ATTINTER
GROUP 1 - ATTINTER EQ 1: YES
GROUP 2 - ATTINTER EQ 2: NO

VARIABLE		NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB.	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB
V15	PLAN AND INSTRUCT STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL									
	GROUP 1	54	4.074	.836	.114					
	GROUP 2	56	4.2321	1.175	.157	1.98	.014	.90	108	.371
V16	INSTURCT STUDENT WITH WIFE RANGE OF ACA									
	GROUP 1	54	4.5370	.770	.105					
	GROUP 2	57	4.6316	.747	.099	1.06	.823	-.66	109	.513
V17	HELP STUDENT UNDERSTAND HOW THEIR BELIE									
	GROUP 1	54	4.2407	.930	.127					
	GROUP 2	57	4.4211	.778	.103	1.43	.189	-1.11	109	.269
V18	PLAN MY OWN TEACHING IMPROVEMENT									
	GROUP 1	54	4.2222	.861	.117					
	GROUP 2	57	4.4386	.802	.106	1.15	.599	-1.37	109	.173
V19	TAKE RESPONSIBILITY FOR WHAT STUDENTS LEARN									
	GROUP 1	54	4.3889	.787	.107					
	GROUP 2	56	4.5000	.714	.095	1.22	.472	-.78	108	.439
V20	OVERCOME OBSTACLES TO CREATING LEARNING									
	GROUP 1	54	4.0185	.901	.123					
	GROUP 2	57	3.9825	1.009	.134	1.25	.407	.20	109	.843
	EXPERIMENT WITH NEW WAYS TO ORGANIZE SCHOOLS									
V21	GROUP 1	54	3.9815	.981	.133					
	GROUP 2	57	4.1404	.875	.116	1.26	.401	-.90	109	.369

17-JUN-96 FOLLOW UP RESEARCH ON ATT GRADUATES JUNE 15, 1996
T-TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT SAMPLES OF ATTINTER
GROUP 1 - ATTINTER EQ 1: YES
GROUP 2 - ATTINTER EQ 2: NO

VARIABLE		NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB.	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB
V22	EXPERIMENT WITH DIFFERENT TEACHING STRATEGIES									
	GROUP 1	54	4.2456	.935	.127					
	GROUP 2	57	4.2456	.912	.121	1.05	.850	.08	109	.938
V23	ASSUME RESPONSIBILTY FOR QUESTIONING W									
	GROUP 1	54	4.0926	.917	.125					
	GROUP 2	57	4.2105	.881	.117	1.08	.769	-.69	109	.491
V24	DESIGN AND USE NEW INSTRUCITONAL STRATEGIES									
	GROUP 1	54	3.9259	.908	.124					
	GROUP 2	57	4.0877	.892	.118	1.04	.894	-.95	109	.346
V25	ANALYZE CURRENT EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH									
	GROUP 1	53	3.2264	1.137	.156					
	GROUP 2	57	3.5439	1.053	.140	1.17	.572	-1.52	108	.132
V26	CONTINUE TO EXPERIMENT AND IMPROVE PRACTICE									
	GROUP 1	54	4.2778	.834	.113					
	GROUP 2	52	4.4423	.669	.093	1.55	.117	-1.12	104	.266
V27	STRENGTHEN MY PROFESSIONAL GROWTH									
	GROUP 1	50	2.7200	1.415	.200					
	GROUP 2	49	3.4286	1.541	.220	1.19	.553	-2.38	97	.019
V28	ENHANCE MY PROFESSIONAL GROWTH									
	GROUP 1	54	3.8889	1.058	.144					
	GROUP 2	56	3.8750	1.046	.140	1.02	.929	.07	108	.945

17-JUN-96 FOLLOW UP RESEARCH ON ATT GRADUATES JUNE 15, 1996
T-TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT SAMPLES OF ATTINTER
GROUP 1 - ATTINTER EQ 1: YES
GROUP 2 - ATTINTER EQ 2: NO

VARIABLE		NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB.	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB
V29	PERSUADING AND MOTIVATING OTHER TEACHERS									
	GROUP 1	53	3.5660	.888	.122	1.34	.286	1.07	108	.285
	GROUP 2	57	3.3684	1.029	.136					
V30	HAVE A GOOD UNDERSTANDING OF MY CHILDREN									
	GROUP 1	54	4.0556	.940	.128	1.34	.278	.02	109	.986
	GROUP 2	57	4.0526	.811	.107					
V31	DIAGNOSE LEARNING NEEDS									
	GROUP 1	54	4.2407	.823	.112	1.08	.783	.30	109	.765
	GROUP 2	57	4.1930	.854	.113					
V32	INTEGRATE HIGHER ORDER THINKING SKILLS									
	GROUP 1	54	4.3704	.708	.096	1.36	.264	1.69	109	.094
	GROUP 2	57	4.1228	.825	.109					
V33	USE COOPERATIVE AND TEAM LEARNING									
	GROUP 1	54	3.5926	1.108	.151	1.01	.963	.07	109	.948
	GROUP 2	57	3.5789	1.101	.146					
V34	USE DIFFERENT KINDS OF TECHNOLOGIES									
	GROUP 1	54	3.6111	1.123	.153	1.01	.983	.48	109	.632
	GROUP 2	57	3.5088	1.120	.148					
V35	USE INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES TO HELP STUDENTS									
	GROUP 1	54	4.0926	.896	.122	1.04	.894	-.08	109	.940
	GROUP 2	57	4.1053	.880	.117					

17-JUN-96 FOLLOW UP RESEARCH ON ATT GRADUATES JUNE 15, 1996
T-TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT SAMPLES OF ATTINTER
GROUP 1 - ATTINTER EQ 1: YES
GROUP 2 - ATTINTER EQ 2: NO

VARIABLE		NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB.	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB
V36	USE THE COMPUTER TO KEEP MY GRADES									
	GROUP 1	54	3.8704	1.428	.194	1.14	.621	1.11	109	.269
	GROUP 2	57	3.5789	1.336	.177					
V37	KNOW HOW TO SELECT AND USE SOFTWARE									
	GROUP 1	54	4.1481	1.123	.153	1.52	.127	2.32	108	.022
	GROUP 2	56	3.5893	1.1385	.185					
V38	DEMOSTRATE TO STUDENTS THAT I APPRECIATE									
	GROUP 1	54	4.6111	.771	.105	1.21	.482	-.82	109	.022
	GROUP 2	57	4.6667	.701	.093					
V39	DEMONSTRATE TO STUDENTS THAT I CARE ABOUT									
	GROUP 1	54	4.6111	.738	.100	1.06	.821	-.40	109	.688
	GROUP 2	57	4.6667	.715	.095					
V40	USE A VARIETY OF STRATEGIES FOR PRESENTING									
	GROUP 1	54	4.3704	.784	.107	1.10	.727	-.33	109	.741
	GROUP 2	57	4.4211	.823	.109					
V41	CHANGE MY WHEN STUDENTS HAVE DIFFICULTY									
	GROUP 1	54	4.4444	.691	.094	1.23	.445	.67	109	.502
	GROUP 2	57	4.3509	.767	.102					
V42	USE MATERIALS FROM A VARIETY OF CULTURAL									
	GROUP 1	53	3.6792	1.052	.145	1.13	.662	-.11	108	.914
	GROUP 2	57	3.7018	1.127	.148					

17-JUN-96 FOLLOW UP RESEARCH ON ATT GRADUATES JUNE 15, 1996
T-TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT SAMPLES OF ATTINTER
GROUP 1 - ATTINTER EQ 1: YES
GROUP 2 - ATTINTER EQ 2: NO

VARIABLE		NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB.	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB
V43	SET HIGH STANDARDS FOR MYSELF									
	GROUP 1	54	4.6111	.685	.093	1.27	.379	-.45	109	.652
	GROUP 2	57	4.6667	.607	.080					
V44	HELP STUDENTS MEET HIGH STANDARDS									
	GROUP 1	54	4.5370	.693	.094	1.19	.531	.84	109	.402
	GROUP 2	57	4.4211	.755	.100					
V45	URBAN EDUCATOR IS LIMITED IN WHAT SHE CA									
	GROUP 1	54	2.4815	1.005	.137	1.35	.275	.04	109	.970
	GROUP 2	57	2.4737	1.167	.155					
V46	UNDERSTAND THE NEEDS OF URBAN CHILDREN									
	GROUP 1	54	4.0185	.765	.104	1.68	.060	.94	109	.348
	GROUP 2	57	3.8596	.990	.131					
V47	CONFIDENT IN IMPLEMENTING COOPERATIVE LEARNING									
	GROUP 1	53	3.9434	1.064	.146	1.15	.612	.40	108	.692
	GROUP 2	57	3.8596	1.141	.151					
V48	ABLE TO ADJUST THE ASSIGNMENT TO NEEDS									
	GROUP 1	53	4.0377	.876	.120	1.28	.360	-1.54	108	.125
	GROUP 2	57	4.2807	.774	.102					
V49	UNDERSTANDING OF RESILIENCY INFLUENCES W									
	GROUP 1	51	4.0784	.821	.115	1.80	.036	2.00	106	.049
	GROUP 2	57	3.7018	1.101	.146					

17-JUN-96 FOLLOW UP RESEARCH ON ATT GRADUATES JUNE 15, 1996
T-TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT SAMPLES OF ATTINTER
GROUP 1 - ATTINTER EQ 1: YES
GROUP 2 - ATTINTER EQ 2: NO

VARIABLE		NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB.	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB
V50	CAN NAME FIVE COMMUNITY AGENCIES WHICH O									
	GROUP 1	53	2.9811	1.278	.176	1.21	.484	-.14	108	.888
	GROUP 2	57	3.0175	1.408	.186					
V51	URBAN TEACHERS SHOULD BE CAUTIONS IN ADO									
	GROUP 1	53	2.0000	1.092	.150	1.27	.384	-.87	108	.388
	GROUP 2	57	2.1930	1.231	.163					
V52	MY CHOICE IS TO TEACH IN AN URBAN CLASSROOM									
	GROUP 1	51	3.3333	1.143	.160	1.22	.470	-.23	106	.822
	GROUP 2	57	3.3860	1.264	.167					
V53	RESILIENCY IS USED TO DESCRIBE SUCCESSFUL									
	GROUP 1	50	3.6200	.780	.110	1.73	.059	1.72	97	.089
	GROUP 2	49	3.3061	1.025	.146					
V54	CAN GET STUDENT BACK ON TASK									
	GROUP 1	52	4.1346	.864	.120	1.10	.743	.89	106	.373
	GROUP 2	56	3.9821	.904	.121					
V55	CONFIDENT OF MY ABILITY TO TEACH IN AN URBAN									
	GROUP 1	52	4.1731	.944	.131	1.67	.065	-.25	106	.800
	GROUP 2	56	4.2143	.731	.098					
V56	TEACHERS SHOULD FOCUS OBJECTIVES ON BASIC									
	GROUP 1	51	2.8627	1.020	.143	1.47	.172	-.21	104	.834
	GROUP 2	55	2.9091	1.236	.167					

17-JUN-96 FOLLOW UP RESEARCH ON ATT GRADUATES JUNE 15, 1996
T-TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT SAMPLES OF ATTINTER
GROUP 1 - ATTINTER EQ 1: YES
GROUP 2 - ATTINTER EQ 2: NO

VARIABLE		NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB.	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB
V57	TEACHERS CAN NOT REALLY EVALUATE GROUP W									
	GROUP 1	53	1.5283	.696	.096	1.65	.071	-1.55	107	.123
	GROUP 2	56	1.7679	.894	.119					
V58	SHOULD RELY ON WHOLE GROUP INSTRUCTION									
	GROUP 1	53	1.8868	.891	.122	1.32	.320	-1.10	106	.272
	GROUP 2	55	2.0909	1.023	.138					
V59	GOOD TEACHERS CREATE THEIR OWN LESSON									
	GROUP 1	53	3.4151	1.184	.163	1.15	.605	- .59	106	.555
	GROUP 2	55	3.5455	1.102	.149					
V60	ENCOURAGE THEIR STUDENTS TO THINK ABOUT									
	GROUP 1	52	3.7885	.893	.124	1.11	.712	.36	105	.717
	GROUP 2	55	3.7273	.849	.114					
V61	MOST IMPORTANT JOB IS TO TEACH CONTENT									
	GROUP 1	53	2.6226	1.042	.143	1.08	.784	- .78	105	.434
	GROUP 2	54	2.7778	1.003	.137					
V62	HAVE FEW DISCIPLINE PROBLEMS WITH MY STUDENTS									
	GROUP 1	53	3.1132	1.251	.172	1.30	.334	-1.72	107	.088
	GROUP 2	56	3.5000	1.095	.146					
V63	SURE TEACHING WILL BE IN LIFE LONG CAREER									
	GROUP 1	53	3.6604	1.239	.170	1.25	.424	.21	107	.833
	GROUP 2	56	3.6071	1.384	.185					

17-JUN-96 FOLLOW UP RESEARCH ON ATT GRADUATES JUNE 15, 1996
T-TESTS FOR INDEPENDENT SAMPLES OF ATTINTER
GROUP 1 - ATTINTER EQ 1: YES
GROUP 2 - ATTINTER EQ 2: NO

VARIABLE		NUMBER OF CASES	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	F VALUE	2-TAIL PROB.	POOLED VARIANCE ESTIMATE T VALUE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	2-TAIL PROB
V64	LOOK FORWARD TO COMING TO SCHOOL EACH DAY									
	GROUP 1	51	3.8627	1.077	.151	1.11	.712	.28	105	.783
	GROUP 2	56	3.8036	1.185	.152					
V65	SOME URBAN STUDENTS ARE UNTEACHABLE									
	GROUP 1	53	2.1132	1.068	.147	1.65	.070	-2.74	106	.007
	GROUP 2	55	2.7636	1.374	.185					
V66	PAST ACIEVEMENT IS THE BEST INDICATOR									
	GROUP 1	53	1.8868	.824	.113	1.29	.356	- .12	105	.904
	GROUP 2	54	1.9074	.937	.128					
V67	LEARNING TO TAKE PLACE NEED TO BE IN CON									
	GROUP 1	53	2.5849	1.216	.167	1.04	.879	-1.53	107	.128
	GROUP 2	56	2.9464	1.242	.166					

APPENDIX E

A Status Report of JUEP Professional Development Schools' School Climate: A Comparison of 1995-1996 Responses

JUEP Survey of School Climate
Comparision of 1995-1996 Responses

Key

1995	
1996	

	SA 5	A 4	U 3	D 2	SD 1	Missing -1
1. I am still excited about our school being a part of JUEP.	61 54.5%	39 34.8%	12 10.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	
	29 48.3%	22 36.7%	5 8.3%	2 3.3%	1 1.7%	1 1.7%
2. I feel participating in JUEP has led to my professional development.	50 44.6%	52 46.4%	3 8.0%	1 .9%	0 0.0%	
	29 48.3%	19 31.7%	6 10.0%	2 3.3%	2 3.3%	2 3.3%
3. I feel that participation in JUEP is a waste of time.	3 2.7%	5 4.4%	8 7.1%	35 31.0%	62 54.9%	
	2 3.3%	3 5.0%	3 5.0%	21 35.0%	29 48.3%	2 3.3%
4. JUEP has helped to improve the achievement of students at my school this year.	38 33.6%	52 46.0%	22 19.5%	1 .9%	0 0.0%	
	13 21.7%	31 51.7%	12 20.0%	2 3.3%	1 1.7%	1 1.7%
5. I do <u>not</u> feel that the project is relative in light of the problems in the Duval County School system.	6 5.4%	4 3.6%	22 19.6%	42 37.5%	38 33.9%	
	1 1.7%	3 5.0%	8 13.3%	25 41.7%	22 36.7%	1 1.7%
6. Teachers and principals work together to run the school effectively.	69 61.1%	39 34.5%	5 4.4%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	
	40 66.7%	18 30.0%	1 1.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 1.7%

Teasur.com

JUEP Survey of School Climate
Comparision of 1995-1996 Responses

	SA 5	A 4	U 3	D 2	SD 1	Missing -1
7. The administrators invites and listens to what teachers have to say.	70 61.9%	40 35.4%	3 2.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	
	35 58.3%	24 40.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 1.7%
8. The administration invites and listens carefully to what students have to say about the school.	45 39.8%	58 51.3%	10 8.8%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	
	25 41.7%	27 45.0%	5 8.3%	2 3.3%	0 0.0%	1 1.7%
9. Teachers, parents, and students have a voice in what happens in the school.	51 45.9%	52 46.8%	8 7.2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	
	26 43.3%	30 50.0%	2 3.3%	1 1.7%	0 0.0%	1 1.7%
10. Students complete their homework assignments.	9 8.0%	39 34.8%	28 25.0%	30 26.8%	6 5.4%	
	8 13.3%	27 45.0%	9 15.0%	12 20.0%	3 5.0%	1 1.7%
11. Students work hard to get good grades and learn at this school.	11 9.8%	63 56.3%	15 13.4%	20 17.9%	3 2.7%	
	9 15.0%	30 50.0%	10 16.7%	9 15.0%	1 1.7%	1 1.7%
12. Students do <u>not</u> really care about this school.	9 8.0%	6 5.3%	17 15.0%	58 51.3%	23 20.4%	
	0 0.0%	9 15.0%	4 6.7%	33 55.0%	13 21.7%	1 1.7%
13. Parent opinions are invited and valued in this school.	46 43.0%	55 51.4%	5 4.1%	1 .9%	0 0.0%	
	25 41.7%	33 55.0%	1 1.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 1.7%

Teasur.com

JUEP Survey of School Climate
Comparision of 1995-1996 Responses

	SA 5	A 4	U 3	D 2	SD 1	Missing -1
14. Everyone in this school is treated with respect.	55 51.4%	41 38.3%	4 3.7%	6 5.6%	1 .9%	
	24 40.0%	28 46.7%	3 5.0%	3 5.0%	0 0.0%	2 3.3%
15. Parents tend to involve themselves in the life and activities of this school.	17 16.0%	44 41.5%	16 15.1%	22 20.8%	7 6.6%	
	9 15.0%	18 30.0%	9 15.0%	19 31.7%	4 6.7%	1 1.7%
16. Teachers willingly spend time to help students at this school.	51 47.7%	52 48.6%	2 2.8%	1 .9%	0 0.0%	
	33 55.0%	27 45.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	
17. Teachers understand and meet the needs of the students at this school.	41 38.3%	61 57.0%	5 4.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	
	22 36.7%	33 55.0%	4 6.7%	1 1.7%	0 0.0%	
18. The morale of this school staff is high.	43 40.6%	49 46.2%	13 12.3%	1 .9%	0 0.0%	
	25 41.7%	26 43.3%	7 11.7%	2 3.3%	0 0.0%	
19. Teachers are enthusiastic at this school.	52 48.6%	51 47.7%	4 3.7%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	
	28 46.7%	27 45.0%	3 5.0%	2 3.3%	0 0.0%	
20. Teachers have too many committee and non-teaching requirements.	13 12.4%	23 21.9%	18 17.1%	41 39.0%	10 9.5%	
	8 13.3%	9 15.0%	7 11.7%	28 46.7%	7 11.7%	1 1.7%

Teasur.com

JUEP Survey of School Climate
Comparision of 1995-1996 Responses

	SA 5	A 4	U 3	D 2	SD 1	Missing -1
21. Students respect and care about one another at this school.	9 8.4%	54 50.5%	19 17.8%	16 15.0%	9 8.4%	
	4 6.7%	31 51.7%	16 26.7%	7 11.7%	2 3.3%	
22. The principal encourages experimentation.	64 59.8%	37 34.6%	3 2.8%	3 2.8%	0 0.0%	
	36 60.0%	24 40.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	
23. Parents and the community support new cirricular and instructional approaches.	16 15.0%	62 57.9%	19 17.8%	6 5.6%	4 3.7%	
	16 26.7%	28 46.7%	15 25.0%	1 1.7%	0 0.0%	
24. I want to be assigned to this school again next year.	71 67.0%	27 25.5%	5 4.7%	3 2.8%	0 0.0%	
	36 60.0%	20 33.3%	2 3.3%	0 0.0%	2 3.3%	

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Collaborative Agenda For Change (Examining the Impact of Urban Professional Development Schools)	
Author(s):	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☐

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Cheryl Fountain	Printed Name/Position/Title: Cheryl Fountain, Coprincipal Investigator	
Organization/Address: University of North Florida Jacksonville Urban Educational Partnership	Telephone: (904) 620-2752	FAX: (904) 620-2457
	E-Mail Address: fountain@unf.edu	Date: 1/14/98

(over)